Vol. 3, No. 3 Fall 2003

Table of Contents

Editor's Note

Enoch Powell's Other Warning — TOQ Editors 3

The Classics Corner

The Road to National Suicide — Enoch Powell 7

Articles

Understanding Jewish Influence II:
Zionism and the Internal Dynamics of Judaism — Kevin MacDonald 15

The Reality of Red Subversion:
The Recent Confirmation of Soviet Espionage in America — Stephen J. Sniegoski 45

Book Reviews

Mexifornia: A State of Becoming — Reviewed by John Attarian 71

The South Under Siege 1830-2000: A History of the Relations between the North and the South — Reviewed by William Scott 79

DNA: The Secret of Life — Reviewed by Leslie Jones 87

The Scientific Study of Intelligence: Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen — Reviewed by Kevin Lamb 93

Editors 100

Editorial Advisory Board 101

The Occidental Quarterly (ISSN 1539-3925), a journal of Western thought and opinion, is published by The Charles Martel Society four times annually in the Fall, Winter, Spring, and Summer. Unsolicited manuscripts from contributing authors should be submitted to the editorial department address: P.O. Box 695, Mt. Airy, MD 21771. Style sheets are available upon request. Subscriptions in the U.S. are $40 annually, $78 for two years, and $114 for three years; subscription rates for Canada $45 (first year), $88 (two years), and $129 (three years); European subscription rates: $60 (first year), $118 (two years) $174 (three years). All subscriptions including additional inquiries or subscription problems should be mailed to the subscription department: P.O. Box 3462 Augusta, GA 30914. Back issues are $10 per issue.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON SUMMIT
PUBLISHERS

Classic Reprints ⚜ Contemporay Works

ANTHROPOLOGY

EVOLUTION

GENETICS

PSYCHOLOGY

PHILOSOPHY

CURRENT EVENTS

WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS (WSP) now offers contemporary works and classic reprints (which include recently abridged versions and texts drawn from earlier works) in the social sciences with particular emphasis on anthropology, evolution and genetics, philosophy, politics and current events, and psychology.

Currently WSP has 12 titles available in its Classic Reprint Series and 30 titles in the Contemporary Titles Series (titles and rights recently purchased from SCOTT-TOWNSEND PUBLISHERS.) Books from WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS are available by order from all major book retailers, or may be purchased directly via the Internet. A complete catalog of the WSP line of publications is available upon inquiry from the address below.

Washington Summit Publishers

P. O. Box 3514
Augusta, GA 30914

WASHINGTON SUMMIT PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 3514 • Augusta, GA 30914

Ph: 706-736-4884 • Fax: 706-733-7652

Books@WSPublishers.com

http://WSPublishers.com

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editor's Note

Enoch Powell's Other Warning

The inaugural issue of *The Occidental Quarterly* contained the first in a regular feature of reprinted speeches, essays, and articles that are either out of print or have been heretofore unpublished, which we named the "Classics Corner." Enoch Powell's celebrated 1968 address on immigration to the West Midlands Area Conservative Political Centre in Birmingham, England, otherwise known as the "Rivers of Blood" speech, stands out as one of the foremost unapologetic statements in defense of Western culture. The importance of Powell's message made it the perfect first selection for this new feature. Although copies of the full text of Powell's speech had been published on the Internet and reprinted in a few edited monographs, its availability had been limited.

Recently, the editors of *TOQ* gained access to a photocopied manuscript of another classic Powell address, his talk before the Stretford Young Conservatives in Manchester, England, on January 21, 1977. In his speech, Powell issued a warning to his fellow countryman about the potential threat of "public violence" and the prospects for a looming racial civil war unless colored immigration levels from the British Commonwealth colonies were drastically reversed. An important point in Powell's speech focused on the draconian measures that were contained in the Race Relations Act of 1976, particularly Section 70, which gave the authorities the power to "criminalize racialism" and to seize advocates of "hate speech" *regardless of intent*. It served as a pretext to ban speeches that were deemed "threatening" and "insulting" and to rein in the activities of nationalist and racialist groups such as the National Front. In his study of the British Commission for Racial Equality, Ray Honeyford writes:

> This section of the Act not only suppressed the expression of overt racialist views. It crucially affected the general climate of opinion surrounding the whole area of race and race relations. Henceforth, perfectly honorable citizens became afraid of expressing *any* opinion about these matters; with the result that important issues connected with the actual state of race relations and the fortunes and progress of the ethnic minorities became taboo subjects.[1]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Powell took the opportunity to criticize the Act, which was to become law in a matter of weeks, and express his outrage over this blatant threat to freedom of speech. In a previous speech to the Monday Club during the first week of October 1976, some four months earlier, Powell, as biographer Simon Heffer points out, "issued as stark a warning about the future than at any time since the Birmingham speech":

> The tag from Virgil's *Aeneid* about the River Tiber has long passed into a byword, but in words devoid of metaphor I have stated my conviction that physical and violent conflict must sooner or later supervene where an indigenous population sees no end to the progressive occupation of its heartland by aliens with whom they do not identify themselves and who do not identify themselves with them. The catastrophe of widespread violence, entrenched in a divided community, can be averted only in the way that other apprehended catastrophes can be averted: namely, by removing its root cause. That root cause is the existing magnitude of the Asian and African population and the certainty of the continuing future increase in that population, proportionately to the rest, which is inherent in its present magnitude and composition. It follows that there is no escape except by way of such a reduction of that existing population as will be sufficient at least to remove the prospect of future growth; in other words to limit its present dimensions the "alien wedge" (I use a famous judicial phrase) in the cities and urban areas of England.[2]

In his Monday Club address, Powell urged the British government to adopt a voluntary repatriation program and to set aside funds that would typically go to rebuilding inner-city slums. He was roundly attacked for making such blunt claims and the controversy that followed, even within conservative circles, set the stage for his remarks in the Stretford speech some four months later.

The British weekly, *The Economist*, published an editorial in the wake of the latter speech and raised the question whether or not Powell should be prosecuted for his remarks:

> Should Mr. Enoch Powell be prosecuted? That, not the future of race relations in Britain, is the issue brought into question by Mr. Powell's speech to the Stretford Young Conservatives in Manchester on January 21st in which he retold his recurrent nightmare. It is a nightmare that seems to recur more often the older he grows and to require more extravagance in each retelling. This time he spoke of the prospect of civil war, of the polarizing effects of color and of the effects of changing race laws…. Predictable, perhaps. But actionable?[3]

The prospect that a Western nation—one of the world's pre-eminent powers—would seriously consider prosecuting a distinguished statesman for speaking candidly about a serious public concern (at the time Attorney General Sam Silkin weighed the prospect of pursuing an indictment), was only an omen of the rot that infests Britain, and the rest of the West, today. For the past thirty years, Britain's political elite has alternately promoted or tolerated non-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

white immigration, while seeking to silence any opposition, verbal or otherwise, to the transformation of a great and largely homogeneous nation into a multicultural, multiethnic travesty. Yet Powell's warning resonated and continues to resonate with the typical Englishman, who grasped more easily than his rulers the direction in which his nation was spiraling.

ENDNOTES

1. Ray Honeyford, *The Commission for Racial Equality* (London: Transaction, 1998), 41-42.
2. Simon Heffer, *Like the Roman: The Life of Enoch Powell* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1998), 778.
3. "Race: Clobber Powell?" *The Economist*, January 29, 1977, 19.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Road to National Suicide

Immigration, the Public Interest and the Uniform of Color

Enoch Powell

The following address is a speech given by the Rt. Hon. J. Enoch Powell, MP, to a meeting of the Stretford Young Conservatives at the Civic Theatre, Stretford, Manchester at 8pm, Friday, 21 January 1977.

Throughout the last twenty years, locally at first, then nationally, one political subject has been different from all the rest in the persistence with which it has endured and the profound and absorbing preoccupation which it has increasingly held for the public. This is all the more remarkable because of the sedulous determination with which this subject has been kept, as far as possible, out of parliamentary debate, and the use which has been made of every device—from legal penalty to trade union proscription—to prevent the open discussion and ventilation of it. No social or political penalty, no threat of private ostracism or public violence, has been spared against those who have nevertheless continued to describe what hundreds of thousands of their fellow citizens daily saw and experienced and to voice the fears for the future by which those fellow citizens were haunted. The efforts that were made during the 1930s to silence, ridicule, or denounce those who warned of the coming war with the fascist dictatorships and who called for the peril to be recognized and met before too late, provide but a pale and imperfect precedent.

In all this suppression more than one powerful motive can be seen at work. On the one hand there is the primitive but widespread superstition that if danger is not mentioned, it will go away, or even that it is created by being identified and can therefore be destroyed again by being left in silence. Akin to this is the natural resentment of ordinary people, but especially of politicians, at being forced to face an appalling prospect with no readily procurable happy ending. The custom of killing messengers who bring bad news is not confined to the kings and tyrants of antiquity or of fiction. On the other hand there are at work the dark motives of those who desire the catastrophic outcome which they foresee. All round the world in various forms the same formula for rending societies apart is being prepared and applied, by ignorance or design, and there are those who are determined to see to it that Britain shall no longer be able to escape. I marvel sometimes that people should be so innocently blind to this nihilism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the ordinary weapons for the suppression of free speech and of frank expression of opinion is to allege that those who warn of a danger, be they right or wrong, actually desire that danger; that those who warn of war desire war; that those who warn of the materials of hatred and conflict being heaped up desire to see hatred and conflict come about. This is why Churchill was denounced as a warmonger. Because he did not fear to envisage and express the possibility and even probability of war, he could be accused of wanting it.

The fallacy is obvious; for the interest of those who desire calamity would obviously lie in keeping silent till it comes, instead of crying out for means and measures to avert it. But the fallacy is nonetheless dangerous for that.

Till now, however, there has been one essential bulwark against suppression of free speech and of open debate upon the nature and reality of the public danger to which I refer and upon the means to cope with it. That has been the necessity for those who aimed at suppression to prove evil intent on the part of their prospective victims. That condition was of vital importance; for it is inherently unlikely that any subject of public anxiety or apprehension can be discussed or debated without touching upon strong feelings, fears, antagonisms, emotions—indeed, that very probability is proportionate to the importance of the subject. If expression of opinion likely to have that effect is rendered criminal *per se*, irrespective of the intention of the speaker, then all free and open public discussion is rendered impossible, to the manifest endangering of the public interest; for the public interest depends upon the preservation of free speech.

It ought to be understood that, in the intention of the legal advisers of the Crown, this bulwark is now to be swept away. That was made clear by a recent exchange of published letters between the attorney general and myself regarding the effect of section 70 of the Race Relations Act, 1976. For a criminal offense under that section to be committed two conditions must be fulfilled. Speech or writing must be "threatening, abusive or insulting;" and it must also be speech or writing by which "having regard to all the circumstances, hatred is likely to be stirred up against any racial group in Great Britain."

Now, I have never in a political speech used language which to my knowledge was in any natural sense of the words "threatening, abusive or insulting." To the contrary, I have always regarded such language as self-defeating in public debate. However, the principal law officer of the Crown has asserted that in his view it was insulting to quote, as I did in a speech at Croydon last October, the expression "alien wedge," which Viscount Radcliffe in a public address had applied to New Commonwealth immigrants, or to express the opinion that, in the foreseeable numbers and circumstances, the New Commonwealth immigrant and immigrant-descended population in our cities is not likely to be able to live and work in harmony with the rest of the population.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The attorney general has further asserted that in his view race hatred against colored members of our community was likely to be stirred up by what I said. He added that he did not believe a court would find that this was my intention. However, when section 70 of the new Act comes into force, intention will become irrelevant. Thus it is clear that the attorney general believes the uttering or publishing of such speech or writing will thereafter be criminal, and that as attorney general he would expect to give his consent to prosecution of the speaker and of the media which report the speech.

The interpretation, which is given for this purpose to the notions of "insulting" and "stirring up hatred," is radically perverse and one-sided, and it goes to the root of the misconceptions which have hindered rational discussion and handling of this subject from the beginning. Let me illustrate them as follows. In his Christmas day sermon the Archbishop of Canterbury said this: "We can view the man with a colored face as a threat....But we can think of it very differently. That man with a different skin color from mine could be an enrichment to my life and that of my neighbors." Now, I am certain that nothing was further from His Grace's intention than to be insulting to the New Commonwealth immigrant and immigrant-descended population and were exactly the sort of words which stir up intense hatred.

I do not see how it can be other than deeply insulting to describe a Jew as that man with a different shaped nose from mine, or a Zambian as that man with a different sort of hair from mine, or a Chinese as that man with narrower eyes and a yellower pigment than mine. To reduce all the deep-seated differences between the various nations, societies, and tribes of mankind to some external physical attribute in this way is to commit the grossest indignity and disrespect to human nature itself. It is a literally inhuman point of view. What is worse, it is insufferable arrogance to suppose that an Iranian or a Bantu wants to be, or to be thought of, as an Englishman under the skin. On the contrary, with few exceptions, he has no idea or intention of any such thing; and quite right too.

The matter unfortunately does not end there. By talking about the consequences of two million New Commonwealth immigrants in England in terms of a single individual and thus ignoring all the facts and circumstances of the real situation, His Grace and those who speak as he does use the language most calculated to stir people to frenzy. To tell the indigenous inhabitants of Brixton or Southall or Leicester or Bradford or Birmingham or Wolverhampton, to tell the pensioners ending their days in streets of nightly terror unrecognizable as their former neighborhoods, to tell the people of towns and cities where whole districts have been transformed into enclaves of foreign lands, that "the man with a colored face could be an enrichment to my life and that of my neighbors" is to drive them beyond the limits of endurance. It is not so much that it is obvious twaddle. It is that it makes cruel mockery of the experience and fears of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of ordinary, decent men and women.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I repeat, I am sure that His Grace is as innocent of intending to cause evil as the attorney general believes a court would find myself to be; and I trust that, if the Archbishop should unfortunately use the same or similar language again after section 70 of the new Act is in force, the attorney general will refrain from authorizing prosecution. Nevertheless, the consequences of the Archbishop's words, whether the reason for them be actual ignorance of the facts or belief that good can come of ignoring the facts, is that people say to themselves: "if the Primate of all England understands no more than that about what has happened, is happening and is going to happen in our cities, then clearly we must look to leaders of a different sort."

The prevalent determination, of which the Archbishop's is a typical though eminent example, not to see or to admit that violence on a disastrous scale is virtually certain if the "alien wedges"—I use Lord Radcliffe's phrase again—in the metropolis and other major English cities and towns increase at the predictable rate, is due I am sure to a grave misconception. It is supposed that those who envisage such a prospect are accusing the immigrant and immigrant-descended population of having the desire and intention to bring this result about. One is thought to be attacking them for harboring aggressive and violent designs. Hence, very largely, the accusations of insult and of stirring up hatred by pointing out the dangers of the future and denying that those dangers can be averted by measures designed to promote what are called "good race relations."

This, I repeat, is a radical misunderstanding, and it is important that if possible it be removed. The truth is that both the indigenous and the immigrant population will alike be the victims, and the unintending victims, of forces created by the circumstances which we have allowed and continue to allow to develop and which we show no intention of ever endeavoring to reverse.

It is impossible to begin to understand the way in which these forces operate if the discussion is conducted, as race relations always are discussed, in terms of moral imperatives and the attitudes of individuals—like and dislike, good will and ill will. The behavior of men in the mass and in society is not the sum total of the behavior of individuals—any more than inflation is the sum total of voluntary individual increases of prices and wages.

A remarkable speech was made exactly a year ago by the Labor Member for Norwood, John Fraser, in which he pointed to what he called "segregation, not legal or enforced or even well-defined or precise, but segregation nevertheless" as a state of affairs which "ought to send a shudder down our spines," and he added that "once it happens, the process is well nigh irreversible." This is an accurate description of the result of a steady and foreseeable increase in a population, or populations, which are not only seen and felt by the rest among whom they live to be distinct and different but which, more importantly, are themselves strongly predisposed to maintain and reinforce that distinctness and difference.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where I part company with Mr. Fraser is that he identified what he called "discrimination" and "deprivation" as the causes of segregation and regarded measures for reducing and preventing discrimination and deprivation as calculated to prevent segregation. The opposite is the case. It is segregation that is the cause, and not the result, of discrimination and deprivation; and measures aimed at reducing discrimination and deprivation only increase segregation and enhance its destructive potential.

In understanding this matter, the beginning of wisdom is to grasp the law that in human societies power is never left unclaimed and unused. It does not blow about, like wastepaper on the streets, ownerless and inert. Men's nature is not only, as Thucydides long ago asserted, to exert power where they have it; men cannot help themselves from exerting power where they have it, whether they want to or not. The colored population of over two million in England, a population which grows at the rate of nearly 100,000 a year while the remainder diminishes, a population which is predominantly concentrated in the central areas of the metropolis and other key urban and industrial centers of England, does possess—simply by reason of segregation and differentiation—a power which would not accrue to a mere random sample of two million persons similarly located but not perceived or perceiving themselves as distinct from the rest.

The potential power derived from this basic and, as it were, physical cause is enhanced by the special circumstances attending upon the New Commonwealth immigration which brought it about. The publicly expressed attitude of the indigenous population towards the colored population is one of apology and self-accusation, denoted, amongst other things, by the passing of ever severer laws for the protection of the minority in circumstances where protection is not intended to be available, and would in practice not be available, for members of the majority who were similarly disadvantaged. The plain effect is, and is understood by both minority and majority to be, to endow the members of a distinctive and growing minority with privilege, and to communicate to them the dangerous conviction that the guilty and apologetic behavior of the majority derives at least in part from fear. This effect is enormously heightened when seen as part of the contemporary worldwide and systematic movement to use color to exploit and foment internal and international conflicts. The result is that the indigenous population perceives its own predicament as that of part of a world minority, which is under verbal and sometimes physical pressure and attack.

Once the position of strength and privilege, natural and psychological, which I have described is created, it is bound to be used as a means to extend that strength and privilege further. In this the situation of a minority which possesses full political rights but yet regards itself and its interests as distinct from, and possibly antagonistic to, those of the host society, is especially favorable. In the narrowly balanced politics of Britain, political support can be auctioned to the highest bidder in return for further privileges and concessions; for the requisite precedents and grievances will always be available and in the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

context—uniquely—privilege enjoys vocal public approval. I think I cannot be the only one to have noticed that if four percent of the population had four percent representation in the House of Commons it would already contain twenty-five colored MPs, or to have wondered how soon measures will be proposed to ensure that the present disproportion is rectified. It is the business of the leaders of distinct and separate populations to see that the power which they possess is used to benefit those for whom they speak. Leaders who fail to do so, or to do so fast enough, find themselves outflanked and superseded by those who are less squeamish. The Gresham's law of extremism, that the more extreme drives out the less extreme, is one of the basic rules of political mechanics which operate in this field: it is a corollary of the general principle that no political power exists without being used.

Both the general law and its Gresham's corollary point, in contemporary circumstances, towards the resort to physical violence, in the form of firearms or high explosive, as being so probable as to be predicted with virtual certainty. The experience of the last decade and more, all round the world, shows that acts of violence, however apparently irrational or inappropriate their targets, precipitate a frenzied search on the part of the society attacked to discover and remedy more and more grievances, real or imaginary, among those from whom the violence is supposed to emanate or on whose behalf it is supposed to be exercised. Those commanding a position of political leverage would then be superhuman if they could refrain from pointing to the acts of terrorism and, while condemning them, declaring that further and faster concessions and grants of privilege are the only means to avoid such acts being repeated on a rising scale. We know that those who thus argue will always find a ready hearing. This is what produces the gearing effect of terrorism in the contemporary world, yielding huge results from acts of violence perpetrated by minimal numbers. It is not, I repeat again and again, that the mass of a particular population are violently or criminally disposed. Far from it; that population soon becomes itself the prisoner of the violence and machinations of an infinitely small minority among it. Just a few thugs, a few shots, a few bombs at the right place and time—and that is enough for disproportionate consequences to follow.

Differentiation by color, where it exists, is an enormously important factor in this context, effective in a number of ways which all operate in the same direction. It is, first, a permanent and involuntary uniform, which performs all and more of the functions of a uniform in warfare, distinguishing one side from the other, friend from foe, and making it possible to see at a glance what is happening, where to render assistance, and where to attack. This is why those who have sought to organize the domination of a majority by a minority have commonly, where possible, used insignia and means of mutual recognition to increase the potency of small numbers.

Moreover, the uniform of color, because it is involuntary and irremovable, becomes an irresistible force for dominating and disciplining those who wear it. They are literally marked people, expected to rally to whatever is designated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as their cause and treated as manifest traitors if they fail to do so. When one has witnessed how the invisible uniform of religion enables the IRA to exert over the mass of peaceful and law-abiding Roman Catholic citizens in Northern Ireland a terror and compulsion far severer than that under which their Protestant fellow citizens live, one can form some idea of the consolidating potential of the visible uniform of color. Finally, color polarizes, and reinforces differentiation and segregation, because the individual, however much, as an individual, he may become, and wish to become, assimilated to the host population, is firmly identified, and thus eventually obliged to identify himself, with the minority to which he belongs. Color is a recruiting sergeant, and a recruiting sergeant for officer material.

I have been describing the forces which, with a kind of mechanical inevitability, invest the New Commonwealth immigrant and immigrant-descended population in England with the sort of power which cannot in the nature of things remain unexerted; but one crucial factor has not yet been mentioned. The consequences of New Commonwealth immigration are not static, they are dynamic. The resultant population is not a fixed element of the total, bearing a proportion to the whole not destined to increase, and representing therefore a phenomenon which, despite all the attendant difficulties of highly differentiated and segregated enclaves, might eventually, by a kind of collective force of habit, become a stable feature of the England of the future. This is probably the mistaken picture still in the minds of many people, including a correspondent who in a letter to me after my last speech on this subject wrote, "After all, what's so terrible about a few race riots?"

What we do know is that upon any conceivable assumptions, short of wholly new policy initiatives, the New Commonwealth immigrant and immigrant-descended population will continue to grow not only absolutely but proportionately until far into the next century. This is implicit in the age-structure of that population, apart from any other causes whatsoever. Thus of the two differentiated populations, one will be advancing and the other retracting, both numerically and territorially. The significance of this fact is again enhanced by the pattern of distribution The picture is not that of a province or corner of the country occupied by a distinct and growing population, though that would be perilous enough. It is of the occupation, more and more intense, of key areas—and, it may be added, of key functions—in the heartlands of the Kingdom. The process is one of which both populations will continuously and increasingly be conscious. It is this fact which, added to all the rest, points to the prospect of eventual conflict upon a scale which cannot adequately be described by any lesser term than civil war.

Thus by our own past actions of commission and omission we have set in motion the processes which will lead to a result equally catastrophic for both the host and the immigrant-descended populations and equally unwilled by both, who will be the prisoners and the victims of their situation. I defy anyone

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to suggest that to trace those processes and to envisage this prospect is to "insult" either population, unless it be an insult to assume that they will act and react as human societies observably do and always have. But still the question may be asked: "So be; but why do you not, forseeing this, keep silence? What is gained by speech?" To this I answer that even if I thought the outcome could by no contrivance be avoided, it would still be one's instinct and one's duty to speak: we cry out to warn our fellow beings of impending catastrophe, whether or not we calculate that they can still escape. The instinct is a healthy instinct, and the duty is a rational duty; for who knows what efforts men are capable of when necessity stares them in the face? Nor have I ever doubted that, once the nature and scale of the consequences were recognized, the common interest of all in averting them could make possible measures hitherto dismissed as impracticable or unthinkable. They would indeed be heroic measures, measures which radically altered the prospective pattern of our future population; but they would be measures based on and operating with human nature as it is, not measures which purport to manipulate and alter human nature by laws, bureaucracy, and propaganda. Such as they are, they will never come, or they will come too late, if a prohibition is placed upon rational and temperate free speech and a premium upon self-deception and willful blindness.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Understanding Jewish Influence II:

Zionism and the Internal Dynamics of Judaism

Kevin MacDonald

Abstract

The history of Zionism illustrates a dynamic within the Jewish community in which the most radical elements end up pulling the entire community in their direction. Zionism began among the most ethnocentric Eastern European Jews and had explicitly racialist and nationalist overtones. However, Zionism was viewed as dangerous among the wider Jewish community, especially the partially assimilated Jews in Western countries, because it opened Jews up to charges of disloyalty and because the Zionists' open racialism and ethnocentric nationalism conflicted with the assimilationist strategy then dominant among Western Jews. Zionist activists eventually succeeded in making Zionism a mainstream Jewish movement, due in large part to the sheer force of numbers of the Eastern European vanguard. Over time, the more militant, expansionist Zionists (the Jabotinskyists, the Likud Party, fundamentalists, and West Bank settlers) have won the day and have continued to push for territorial expansion within Israel. This has led to conflicts with Palestinians and a widespread belief among Jews that Israel itself is threatened. The result has been a heightened group consciousness among Jews and ultimately support for Zionist extremism among the entire organized American Jewish community.

In the first part of this series I discussed Jewish ethnocentrism as a central trait influencing the success of Jewish activism.[1] In the contemporary world, the most important example of Jewish ethnocentrism and extremism is Zionism. In fact, Zionism is incredibly important. As of this writing, the United States has recently accomplished the destruction of the Iraqi regime, and it is common among influential Jews to advocate war between the United States and the entire Muslim world. In a recent issue of *Commentary* (an influential journal published by the American Jewish Committee), editor Norman Podhoretz states, "The regimes that richly deserve to be overthrown and replaced are not confined to the three singled-out members of the axis of evil [i.e., Iraq, Iran, and North Korea]. At a minimum, the axis should extend to Syria and Lebanon and Libya, as well as 'friends' of America like the Saudi royal family and Egypt's Hosni Mubarak, along with the Palestinian Authority, whether headed by Arafat or one of his henchmen."[2] More than anything else, this is a list of countries that Israel doesn't like, and, as I discuss in the third part of this series, intensely committed Zionists with close links to Israel occupy prominent positions in the Bush administration, especially in the Department

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Defense and on the staff of Vice President Dick Cheney. The long-term consequence of Zionism is that the U.S. is on the verge of attempting to completely transform the Arab/Muslim world to produce governments that accept Israel and whatever fate it decides for the Palestinians, and, quite possibly, to set the stage for further Israeli expansionism.

Zionism is an example of an important principle in Jewish history: At all the turning points, it is the more ethnocentric elements—one might term them the radicals—who have determined the direction of the Jewish community and eventually won the day.[3] As recounted in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jews who returned to Israel after the Babylonian captivity energetically rid the community of those who had intermarried with the racially impure remnant left behind. Later, during the period of Greek dominance, there was a struggle between the pro-Greek assimilationists and the more committed Jews, who came to be known as Maccabeans.

> At that time there appeared in Israel a group of renegade Jews, who incited the people. "Let us enter into a covenant with the Gentiles round about," they said, "because disaster upon disaster has overtaken us since we segregated ourselves from them." The people thought this a good argument, and some of them in their enthusiasm went to the king and received authority to introduce non-Jewish laws and customs. They built a sports stadium in the gentile style in Jerusalem. They removed their marks of circumcision and repudiated the holy covenant. They intermarried with Gentiles, and abandoned themselves to evil ways.[4]

The victory of the Maccabeans reestablished Jewish law and put an end to assimilation. The Book of Jubilees, written during this period, represents the epitome of ancient Jewish nationalism, in which God represents the national interests of the Jewish people in dominating all other peoples of the world:

> I am the God who created heaven and earth. I shall increase you, and multiply you exceedingly; and kings shall come from you and shall rule wherever the foot of the sons of man has trodden. I shall give to your seed all the earth which is under heaven, and they shall rule over all the nations according to their desire; and afterwards they shall draw the whole earth to themselves and shall inherit it forever.[5]

A corollary of this is that throughout history in times of trouble there has been an upsurge in religious fundamentalism, mysticism, and messianism.[6] For example, during the 1930s in Germany liberal Reform Jews became more conscious of their Jewish identity, increased their attendance at synagogue, and returned to more traditional observance (including a reintroduction of Hebrew). Many of them became Zionists.[7] As I will discuss in the following, every crisis in Israel has resulted in an increase in Jewish identity and intense mobilization of support for Israel. Today the people who are being rooted out of the Jewish community are Jews living in the Diaspora who do not support the aims of the Likud Party in Israel. The overall argument here is that Zionism is an example of the trajectory of Jewish radicalism. The radical movement begins among the more committed segments of the Jewish community, then

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spreads and eventually becomes mainstream within the Jewish community; then the most extreme continue to push the envelope (e.g., the settlement movement on the West Bank), and other Jews eventually follow because the more extreme positions come to define the essence of Jewish identity. An important part of the dynamic is that Jewish radicalism tends to result in conflicts with non-Jews, with the result that Jews feel threatened, become more group-oriented, and close ranks against the enemy—an enemy seen as irrationally and incomprehensibly anti-Jewish. Jews who fail to go along with what is now a mainstream position are pushed out of the community, labeled "self-hating Jews" or worse, and relegated to impotence.

TABLE 1:

JEWISH RADICALS EVENTUALLY TRIUMPH WITHIN THE JEWISH COMMUNITY: THE CASE OF ZIONISM

1. Zionism began among the more ethnocentric, committed segments of the Jewish community (1880s).
2. Then it spread and became mainstream within the Jewish community despite its riskiness (1940s). Supporting Zionism comes to define what being Jewish is.
3. Then the most extreme among the Zionists continued to push the envelop (e.g., the settlement movement on the West Bank; constant pressure on border areas in Israel).
4. Jewish radicalism tends to result in conflicts with non-Jews (e.g., the settlement movement); violence (e.g., Intifadas) and other expressions of anti-Jewish sentiment increase.
5. Jews in general feel threatened and close ranks against what they see as yet another violent, incomprehensible manifestation of the eternally violent hatred of Jews. This reaction is the result of psychological mechanisms of ethnocentrism: Moral particularism, self-deception, and social identity.
6. In the U.S., this effect is accentuated because committed, more intensely ethnocentric Jews dominate Jewish activist groups.
7. Jews who fail to go along with what is now a mainstream position are pushed out of the community, labeled "self-hating Jews" or worse, and relegated to impotence.

The origins of Zionism and other manifestations of the intense Jewish dynamism of the twentieth century lie in the Yiddish-speaking world of Eastern Europe in the early nineteenth century. Originally invited in by nobles as estate managers, toll farmers, bankers, and moneylenders, Jews in Poland expanded into commerce and then into artisanry, so that there came to be competition between Jews and non-Jewish butchers, bakers, blacksmiths, shoemakers, and tailors. This produced the typical resource-based anti-Jewish attitudes and behavior so common throughout Jewish history.[8] Despite periodic restrictions and outbursts of hostility, Jews came to dominate the entire economy apart

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from agricultural labor and the nobility. Jews had an advantage in the competition in trade and artisanry because they were able to control the trade in raw materials and sell at lower prices to coethnics.[9]

This increasing economic domination went along with a great increase in the population of Jews. Jews not only made up large percentages of urban populations, they increasingly migrated to small towns and rural areas. In short, Jews had overshot their economic niche: The economy was unable to support this burgeoning Jewish population in the sorts of positions that Jews had traditionally filled, with the result that a large percentage of the Jewish population became mired in poverty. The result was a cauldron of ethnic hostility, with the government placing various restrictions on Jewish economic activity; rampant anti-Jewish attitudes; and increasing Jewish desperation.

The main Jewish response to this situation was an upsurge of fundamentalist extremism that coalesced in the Hasidic movement and, later in the nineteenth century, into political radicalism and Zionism as solutions to Jewish problems. Jewish populations in Eastern Europe had the highest rate of natural increase of any European population in the nineteenth century, with a natural increase of 120,000 per year in the 1880s and an overall increase within the Russian Empire from one to six million in the course of the nineteenth century.[10] Anti-Semitism and the exploding Jewish population, combined with economic adversity, were of critical importance for producing the sheer numbers of disaffected Jews who dreamed of deliverance in various messianic movements—the ethnocentric mysticism of the Kabbala, Zionism, or the dream of a Marxist political revolution.

Religious fanaticism and messianic expectations have been a typical Jewish response to hard times throughout history.[11] For example, in the eighteenth-century Ottoman Empire there was "an unmistakable picture of grinding poverty, ignorance, and insecurity"[12] among Jews that, in the context of high levels of anti-Semitism, effectively prevented Jewish upward mobility. These phenomena were accompanied by the prevalence of mysticism and a high fertility rate among Jews, which doubtlessly exacerbated the problems.

The Jewish population explosion in Eastern Europe in the context of poverty and politically imposed restrictions on Jews was responsible for the generally destabilizing effects of Jewish radicalism in Eastern Europe and Russia up to the revolution. These conditions also had spillover effects in Germany, where the negative attitudes toward the immigrant *Ostjuden* (Eastern Jews) and their foreign, clannish ways contributed to the anti-Semitism of the period.[13] In the United States, radical political beliefs held by a great many Jewish immigrants and their descendants persisted even in the absence of difficult economic and political conditions and have had a decisive influence on U.S. political and cultural history into the present. The persistence of these beliefs influenced the general political sensibility of the Jewish community and has had a destabilizing effect on American society, ranging

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the paranoia of the McCarthy era to the triumph of the 1960s countercultural revolution.[14] In the contemporary world, the descendants of these religious fundamentalists constitute the core of the settler movement and other manifestations of Zionist extremism in Israel.

The hypothesis pursued here is that Jewish population dynamics beginning in the nineteenth century resulted in a feed-forward dynamic: Increasing success in economic competition led to increased population. This in turn led to anti-Jewish reactions and eventually to Jewish overpopulation, poverty, anti-Jewish hostility, and religious fanaticism as a response to external threat. In this regard, Jewish populations are quite the opposite of European populations, in which there is a long history of curtailing reproduction in the face of perceived scarcity of resources.[15] This may be analyzed in terms of the individualism/collectivism dimension, which provides a general contrast between Jewish and European culture:[16] Individualists curtail reproduction in response to adversity in order to better their own lives, whereas a group-oriented culture such as Judaism responds to adversity by strengthening group ties; forming groups with charismatic leaders and a strong sense of ingroup and outgroup; adopting mystical, messianic ideologies; and increasing their fertility—all of which lead to greater conflict.

There is an association between religious or ethnic fanaticism and fertility, and it is quite common for competing ethnic groups to increase their fertility in response to perceived external threats.[17] Ethnic activists respond to the perceived need to increase the numbers of their group in several ways, including exhorting coethnics to reproduce early and often, banning birth control and abortions, curtailing female employment in order to free women for the task of reproducing, and providing financial incentives. In the contemporary world, Jewish activists both within Israel and in the Diaspora have been strong advocates of increasing Jewish fertility, motivated by the threat of intermarriage in the Diaspora, the threat of wars with Israel's neighbors, and as a reaction to Jewish population losses stemming from the Holocaust. Pro-natalism has deep religious significance for Jews as a religious commandment.[18] Within Israel, there is "a nationwide obsession with fertility," as indicated by the highest rate of in-vitro fertilization clinics in the world—one for every 28,000 citizens. This is more than matched by the Palestinians. Originating in the same group-oriented, collectivist culture area as the Jews, the Palestinians have the highest birth rate in the world and have been strongly attracted to charismatic leaders, messianic religious ideology, and desperate, suicidal solutions for their political problems.[19]

For the Jews, the religious fundamentalism characteristic of Eastern Europe from around 1800–1940 has been a demographic wellspring for Judaism. Jewish populations in the West have tended to have low fertility. Beginning in the nineteenth century, Western Jewish populations would have stagnated or declined in the absence of "the unending stream of immigrants from Jewish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

communities in the East."[20] But the point here is that this demographic wellspring created the stresses and strains within this very talented and energetic population that continue to reverberate in the modern world.

These trends can be seen by describing the numerically dominant Hasidic population in early nineteenth-century Galicia, then a province of the Austro-Hungarian empire; similar phenomena occurred throughout the Yiddish-speaking, religiously fundamentalist culture area of Eastern Europe, most of which came to be governed by the Russian empire.[21] Beginning in the late eighteenth century, there were increasing restrictions on Jewish economic activity, such as edicts preventing Jews from operating taverns, engaging in trade, and leasing mills. There were restrictions on where Jews could live, and ghettos were established in order to remove Jews from competition with non-Jews; taxes specific to Jews were imposed; there were government efforts to force Jewish assimilation, as by requiring the legal documents be in the German language. These laws, even though often little enforced, reflected the anti-Jewish animosity of wider society and undoubtedly increased Jewish insecurity. In any case, a large percentage of the Jewish population was impoverished and doubtless would have remained so even in the absence of anti-Jewish attitudes and legislation. Indeed, the emigration of well over three million Jews to Western Europe and the New World did little to ease the grinding poverty of a large majority of the Jewish population.

It was in this atmosphere that Hasidism rose to dominance in Eastern Europe. The Hasidim passionately rejected all the assimilatory pressures coming from the government. They so cherished the Yiddish language that well into the twentieth century the vast majority of Eastern European Jews could not speak the languages of the non-Jews living around them.[22] They turned to the Kabbala (the writings of Jewish mystics), superstition, and anti-rationalism, believing in "magical remedies, amulets, exorcisms, demonic possession (dybbuks), ghosts, devils, and teasing, mischievous genies."[23] Corresponding to this intense ingroup feeling were attitudes that non-Jews were less than human. "As Mendel of Rymanów put it, 'A Gentile does not have a heart, although he has an organ that resembles a heart.' "[24] All nations exist only by virtue of the Jewish people: "Erez Yisreal [the land of Israel] is the essence of the world and all vitality stems from it."[25] Similar attitudes are common among contemporary Jewish fundamentalists and the settler movement in Israel.[26]

The Hasidim had an attitude of absolute faith in the person of the *zaddic*, their rebbe, who was a charismatic figure seen by his followers literally as the personification of God in the world. Attraction to charismatic leaders is a fundamental feature of Jewish social organization—apparent as much among religious fundamentalists as among Jewish political radicals or elite Jewish intellectuals.[27] The following account of a scene at a synagogue in Galicia in 1903 describes the intense emotionality of the community and its total subordination to its leader:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> There were no benches, and several thousand Jews were standing closely packed together, swaying in prayer like the corn in the wind. When the rabbi appeared the service began. Everybody tried to get as close to him as possible. The rabbi led the prayers in a thin, weeping voice. It seemed to arouse a sort of ecstasy in the listeners. They closed their eyes, violently swaying. The loud praying sounded like a gale. Anyone seeing these Jews in prayer would have concluded that they were the most religious people on earth.[28]

At the end of the service, those closest to the rabbi were intensely eager to eat any food touched by him, and the fish bones were preserved by his followers as relics. Another account notes that "devotees hoping to catch a spark from this holy fire run to receive him."[29] The power of the zaddic extends so far "that whatever God does, it is also within the capacity of the zaddic to do."[30]

An important role for the zaddic is to produce wealth for the Jews, and by taking it from the non-Jews. According to Hasidic doctrine, the non-Jews have the preponderance of good things, but

> It was the zaddic who was to reverse this situation. Indeed, R. Meir of Opatów never wearied of reiterating in his homilies that the zaddik must direct his prayer in a way that the abundance which he draws down from on high should not be squandered during its descent, and not "wander away," that is, outside, to the Gentiles, but that it mainly reach the Jews, the holy people, with only a residue flowing to the Gentiles, who are "the other side" (Satan's camp).[31]

The zaddics' sermons were filled with pleas for vengeance and hatred toward the non-Jews, who were seen as the source of their problems.

These groups were highly authoritarian—another fundamental feature of Jewish social organization.[32] Rabbis and other elite members of the community had extraordinary power over other Jews in traditional societies—literally the power of life and death. Jews who informed the authorities about the illegal activities of other Jews were liquidated on orders of secret rabbinical courts, with no opportunity to defend themselves. Jews accused of heretical religious views were beaten or murdered. Their books were burned or buried in cemeteries. When a heretic died, his body was beaten by a special burial committee, placed in a cart filled with dung, and deposited outside the Jewish cemetery. In places where the authorities were lax, there were often pitched battles between different Jewish sects, often over trivial religious points such as what kind of shoes a person should wear. In 1838 the governor of southwestern Russia issued a directive that the police keep tabs on synagogues because "Very often something happens that leaves dead Jews in its wake."[33] Synagogues had jails near the entrance, and prisoners were physically abused by the congregation as they filed in for services.

Not surprisingly, these groups had extraordinary solidarity; a government official observed, "The Hasidim are bound to each other with heart and soul."[34] This solidarity was based not only on the personality of the rebbe and the powerful social controls described above, but on the high levels of within-group generosity which alleviated to some extent their poverty. Needless to say,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hasidic solidarity was seen as threatening by outsiders: "How much longer will we tolerate the Hasidic sect, which is united by such a strong bond and whose members help one another."[35]

Hasidism triumphed partly by its attraction to the Jewish masses and partly because of the power politics of the rebbes: Opposing rabbis were forced out, so by the early nineteenth century in Galicia, Poland, and the Ukraine, the vast majority of Jews were in Hasidic communities. Their triumph meant the failure of the Jewish Enlightenment (the *Haskalah*) in Eastern Europe. The Haskalah movement advocated greater assimilation with non-Jewish society, as by using vernacular languages, studying secular subjects, and not adopting distinguishing forms of dress, although in other ways their commitment to Judaism remained powerful. These relatively assimilated Jews were the relatively thin upper crust of wealthy merchants and others who were free of the economic and social pressures that fueled Hasidism. They often cooperated with the authorities in attempts to force the Hasidim to assimilate out of fear that Hasidic behavior led to anti-Jewish attitudes.

As noted above, one source of the inward unity and psychological fanaticism of Jewish communities was the hostility of the surrounding non-Jewish population. Jews in the Russian Empire were hated by all the non-Jewish classes, who saw them as an exploitative class of petty traders, middlemen, innkeepers, store owners, estate agents, and money lenders.[36] Jews "were viewed by the authorities and by much of the rest of population as a foreign, separate, exploitative, and distressingly prolific nation."[37] In 1881 these tensions boiled over into several anti-Jewish pogroms in a great many towns of southern and southwestern Russia. It was in this context that the first large-scale stirrings of Zionism emerged.[38] From 1881–1884, dozens of Zionist groups formed in the Russian Empire and Romania.

Political radicalism emerged from the same intensely Jewish communities during this period and for much the same reasons.[39] Political radicalism often coexisted with messianic forms of Zionism as well as intense commitment to Jewish nationalism and religious and cultural separatism, and many individuals held various and often rapidly changing combinations of these ideas.[40]

The two streams of political radicalism and Zionism, each stemming from the teeming fanaticism of threatened Jewish populations in nineteenth-century Eastern Europe, continue to reverberate in the modern world. In both England and America the immigration of Eastern European Jews after 1880 had a transformative effect on the political attitudes of the Jewish community in the direction of radical politics and Zionism, often combined with religious orthodoxy.[41] The immigrant Eastern European Jews demographically swamped the previously existing Jewish communities in both countries, and the older community reacted to this influx with considerable trepidation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because of the possibility of increased anti-Semitism. Attempts were made by the established Jewish communities to misrepresent the prevalence of radical political ideas and Zionism among the immigrants.[42]

The Zionist and radical solutions for Jewish problems differed, of course, with the radicals blaming the Jewish situation on the economic structure of society and attempting to appeal to non-Jews in an effort to completely restructure social and economic relationships. (Despite attempting to appeal to non-Jews, the vast majority of Jewish radicals had a very strong Jewish communal identity and often worked in an entirely Jewish milieu.[43]) Among Zionists, on the other hand, it was common from very early on to see the Jewish situation as resulting from irresoluble conflict between Jews and non-Jews. The early Zionist Moshe Leib Lilienblum emphasized that Jews were strangers who competed with local peoples: "A stranger can be received into a family, but only as a guest. A guest who bothers, or competes with or displaces an authentic member of the household is promptly and angrily reminded of his status by the others, acting out of a sense of self-protection."[44] Later, Theodor Herzl argued that a prime source of modern anti-Semitism was that Jews had come into direct economic competition with the non-Jewish middle classes. Anti-Semitism based on resource competition was rational: Herzl "insisted that one could not expect a majority to 'let themselves be subjugated' by formerly scorned outsiders whom they had just released from the ghetto.... I find the anti-Semites are fully within their rights."[45] In Germany, Zionists analyzed anti-Semitism during the Weimar period as "the inevitable and justifiable response of one people to attempts by another to make it share in the formation of its destiny. It was an instinctive response independent of reason and will, and hence common to all peoples, the Jews included."[46]

As was often the case during the period, Zionists had a much clearer understanding of their fellow Jews and the origins of anti-Jewish attitudes. Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, a prominent Zionist and leader of the American Jewish Congress whose membership derived from Eastern Europe immigrants and their descendants, accused Western European Jews of deception by pretending to be patriotic citizens while really being Jewish nationalists: "They wore the mask of the ruling nationality as of old in Spain—the mask of the ruling religion."[47] Wise had a well-developed sense of dual loyalty, stating on one occasion "I am not an American citizen of Jewish faith. I am a Jew. I am an American. I have been an American 63/64ths of my life, but I have been a Jew for 4000 years."[48]

Zionists in Western countries were also at the ethnocentric end of the Jewish population. Zionism was seen as a way of combating the assimilatory pressures of Western societies: "Zionist ideologues and publicists argued that in the West assimilation was as much a threat to the survival of the Jewish people as persecution was in the East."[49] Zionism openly accepted a national/ethnic conceptualization of Judaism that was quite independent of religious faith. As

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Theodore Herzl stated, "We are a people—one people."[50] The Zionist Arthur Hertzberg stated that "the Jews in all ages were essentially a nation and ... all other factors profoundly important to the life of this people, even religion, were mainly instrumental values."[51] There were a number of Zionist racial scientists in the period from 1890–1940, including Elias Auerbach, Aron Sandler, Felix Theilhaber, and Ignaz Zollschan. Zionist racial scientists were motivated by a perceived need to end Jewish intermarriage and preserve Jewish racial purity.[52] Only by creating a Jewish homeland and leaving the assimilatory influences of the Diaspora could Jews preserve their unique racial heritage.

For example, Auerbach advocated Zionism because it would return Jews "back into the position they enjoyed before the nineteenth century—politically autonomous, culturally whole, and racially pure."[53] Zollschan, whose book on "the Jewish racial question" went through five editions and was well known to both Jewish and non-Jewish anthropologists,[54] praised Houston Stewart Chamberlain and advocated Zionism as the only way to retain Jewish racial purity from the threat of mixed marriages and assimilation.[55] Zollschan's description of the phenotypic, and by implication genetic commonality of Jews around the world is striking. He notes that the same Jewish faces can be seen throughout the Jewish world among Ashkenazi, Sephardic, and Oriental Jews. He also remarked on the same mix of body types, head shapes, skin, and hair and eye pigmentation in these widely separated groups.[56]

For many Zionists, Jewish racialism went beyond merely asserting and shoring up the ethnic basis of Judaism, to embrace the idea of racial superiority. Consistent with the anti-assimilationist thrust of Zionism, very few Zionists intermarried, and those who did, such as Martin Buber, found that their marriages were problematic within the wider Zionist community.[57] In 1929 the Zionist leaders of the Berlin Jewish community condemned intermarriage as a threat to the "racial purity of stock" and asserted its belief that "consanguinity of the flesh and solidarity of the soul" were essential for developing a Jewish nation, as was the "will to establish a closed brotherhood over against all other communities on earth."[58]

Assertions of Zionist racialism continued into the National Socialist period, where they dovetailed with National Socialist attitudes. Joachim Prinz, a German Jew who later became the head of the American Jewish Congress, celebrated Hitler's ascent to power because it signaled the end of the Enlightenment values, which had resulted in assimilation and mixed marriage among Jews:

> We want assimilation to be replaced by a new law: *the declaration of belonging to the Jewish nation and the Jewish race*. A state built upon the principle of the purity of nation and race can only be honoured and respected by a Jew who declares his belonging to his own kind.... For only he who honours his *own* breed and his *own* blood can have an attitude of honour towards the *national will of other nations*.[59]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The common ground of the racial Zionists and their non-Jewish counterparts included the exclusion of Jews from the German *Volksgemeinschaft*.[60] Indeed, shortly after Hitler came to power, the Zionist Federation of Germany submitted a memorandum to the German government outlining a solution to the Jewish question and containing the following remarkable statement. The Federation declared that the Enlightenment view that Jews should be absorbed into the nation state

> discerned only the individual, the single human being freely suspended in space, without regarding the ties of blood and history or spiritual distinctiveness. Accordingly, the liberal state demanded of the Jews assimilation [via baptism and mixed marriage] into the non-Jewish environment.... Thus it happened that innumerable persons of Jewish origin had the chance to occupy important positions and to come forward as representatives of German culture and German life, without having their belonging to Jewry become visible. Thus arose a state of affairs which in political discussion today is termed "debasement of Germandom," or "Jewification."...Zionism has no illusions about the difficulty of the Jewish condition, which consists above all in an abnormal occupational pattern and in the fault of an intellectual and moral posture not rooted in one's own tradition.[61]

Zionism As a "Risky Strategy"

Zionism was a risky strategy—to use Frank Salter's term[62]—because it led to charges of dual loyalty. The issue of dual loyalty has been a major concern throughout the history of Zionism. From the beginnings of Zionism, the vast majority of the movement's energy and numbers, and eventually its leadership, stemmed from the Eastern European wellspring of Judaism.[63] In the early decades of the twentieth century, there was a deep conflict within the Jewish communities of Western Europe and the U.S., pitting the older Jewish communities originating in Western Europe (particularly Germany) against the new arrivals from Eastern Europe, who eventually overwhelmed them by force of numbers.[64] Thus, an important theme of the history of Jews in America, England, and Germany was the conflict between the older Jewish communities that were committed to some degree of cultural assimilation and the ideals of the Enlightenment, versus the Yiddish-speaking immigrants from Eastern Europe and their commitment to political radicalism, Zionism, and/or religious fundamentalism. The older Jewish communities were concerned that Zionism would lead to anti-Semitism due to charges of dual loyalty and because Jews would be perceived as a nation and an ethnic group rather than simply as a religion. In England, during the final stages before the issuance of the Balfour Declaration, Edwin Montagu "made a long, emotional appeal to his colleagues [in the British cabinet]: how could he represent the British government during the forthcoming mission to India if the same government declared that his (Montagu's) national home was on Turkish territory?"[65]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Similar concerns were expressed in the United States, but by 1937 most American Jews advocated a Jewish state, and the Columbus Platform of the Reform Judaism of 1937 officially accepted the idea of a Palestinian homeland and shortly thereafter accepted the idea of political sovereignty for Jews in Israel.[66]

In post–World War I Germany, a major goal of Reform Judaism was to suppress Zionism because of its perceived effect of fanning the flames of anti-Semitism due to charges of Jewish disloyalty.[67] In *Mein Kampf,* Hitler argued that Jews were an ethnic group and not simply a religion, which was confirmed by his discovery that "among them was a great movement ... which came out sharply in confirmation of the national character of the Jews: this was the *Zionists.*"[68] Hitler went on to remark that although one might suppose that only a subset of Jews were Zionists and that Zionism was condemned by the great majority of Jews, "the so-called liberal Jews did not reject Zionists as non-Jews, but only as Jews with an impractical, perhaps even dangerous, way of publicly avowing their Jewishness. Intrinsically they remained unalterably of one piece."[69]

Hitler's comments reflect the weak position of the Zionists of his day as a small minority of Jews, but they also show the reality of the worst fears of the German Reform movement during this period: that the publicly expressed ethnocentric nationalism of the Zionists would increase anti-Semitism, because Jews would be perceived not as a religious group but as an ethnic/national entity with no ties to Germany. The existence of Zionism as well as of international Jewish organizations such as the Alliance Israélite Universelle (based in France) and continued Jewish cultural separatism were important sources of German anti-Semitism beginning in the late nineteenth century.

In the Soviet Union, Stalin regarded Jews as politically unreliable after they expressed "overwhelming enthusiasm" for Israel and attempted to emigrate to Israel, especially since Israel was leaning toward the West in the Cold War.[70] During the fighting in 1948, Soviet Jews attempted to organize an army to fight in Israel, and there were a great many other manifestations of Soviet-Jewish solidarity with Israel, particularly in the wake of Jewish enthusiasm during Golda Meir's visit to the Soviet Union. Stalin perceived a "psychological readiness on the part of the volunteers to be under the jurisdiction of two states—the homeland of all the workers and the homeland of all the Jews—something that was categorically impossible in his mind."[71] There is also some indication that Stalin, at the height of the Cold War, suspected that Soviet Jews would not be loyal to the Soviet Union in a war with America because many of them had relatives in America.[72]

In the U.S., the dual loyalty issue arose because there was a conflict between perceived American foreign policy interests that began with the Balfour Declaration of 1917. The U. S. State Department feared that a British protectorate in Palestine would damage commercial interests in the region and that in any case it was not in the interests of America to offend Turkey or other Middle Eastern states.[73] While President Woodrow Wilson sympathized with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the State Department position, he was eventually persuaded by American Zionists, notably Louis Brandeis, to endorse the declaration; it was then quickly approved by the British.

The dual loyalty issue was also raised in Britain, most especially after the Second World War, when the Labour government failed to support the creation of a Jewish state. Many British Jews gave generously to finance illegal activities in the British protectorate of Palestine, including the smuggling of arms and refugees and Jewish attacks on British forces.[74] British losses to Jewish terrorism during this period were not trivial: the bombing of the King David Hotel by future Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin and his associates led to the deaths of eighty-three of the British administrative staff plus five members of the public. These activities led to widespread hostility toward Jews, and the Labour government pointedly refused to outlaw anti-Semitism during this period. During the late 1960s and 1970s, charges of dual loyalty appeared in the House of Commons among Labour MPs, one of whom commented that "it is undeniable that many MPs have what I can only term a dual loyalty, which is to another nation and another nation's interests."[75]

Attitudes ranging from unenthusiastic ambivalence to outright hostility to the idea of a Zionist homeland on the part of presidents, the State Department, Congress, or the American public persisted right up until the establishment of Israel in 1948 and beyond. After World War II, there continued to be a perception in the State Department that American interests in the area would not be served by a Jewish homeland, but should be directed at securing oil and military bases to oppose the Soviets. There was also concern that such a homeland would be a destabilizing influence for years to come because of Arab hostility.[76] Truman's defense secretary, James Forrestal, "was all but obsessed by the threat to [American interests] he discerned in Zionist ambitions. His concern was shared by the State Department and specifically by the Near East Desk."[77] In 1960 Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, declared in response to attempts to coerce Egypt into agreeing to Israel's use of the Suez Canal, "in recent years we have seen the rise of organizations dedicated apparently not to America, but to foreign states and groups. The conduct of a foreign policy for America has been seriously compromised by this development."[78] Truman himself eventually caved in to Zionist pressure out of desire to ensure Jewish support in the 1948 election, and despite his own recently revealed personal misgivings about Jewish myopia in pursuit of their own interests.[79]

Zionist Extremism Becomes Mainstream

Since the Second World War, there has been a long evolution such that the American Jewish community now fully supports the settler movement and other right-wing causes within Israel. Zionists made a great deal of progress during the Second World War. They engaged in "loud diplomacy," organizing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands of rallies, dinners with celebrity speakers (including prominent roles for sympathetic non-Jews), letter-writing campaigns, meetings, lobbying, threats against newspapers for publishing unfavorable items, insertion of propaganda as news items in the press, and giving money to politicians and non-Jewish celebrities in return for their support.[80] By 1944, thousands of non-Jewish associations would pass pro-Zionist resolutions, and both Republican and Democratic platforms included strong pro-Zionist planks, even though the creation of a Jewish state was strongly opposed by the Departments of State and War.[81]

A 1945 poll found that 80.5% of Jews favored a Jewish state, with only 10.5% opposed.[82] This shows that by the end of the Second World War, Zionism had become thoroughly mainstream within the U.S. Jewish community. The triumph of Zionism occurred well before consciousness of the Holocaust came to be seen as legitimizing Israel. (Michael Novick dates the promotion of the Holocaust to its present status as a cultural icon from the 1967 Six-Day War.[83]) What had once been radical and viewed as dangerous had become not only accepted, but seen as central to Jewish identity.

Since the late 1980s, the American Jewish community has not been even-handed in its support of Israeli political factions, but has supported the more fanatical elements within Israel. While wealthy Israelis predominantly support the Labor Party, financial support for Likud and other right-wing parties comes from foreign sources, particularly wealthy U.S. Jews.[84] The support of these benefactors is endangered by any softening of Likud positions, with support then going to the settler movement. "Organized U.S. Jews are chauvinistic and militaristic in their views."[85]

Within Israel, there has been a transformation in the direction of the most radical, ethnocentric, and aggressive elements of the population. During the 1920s–1940s, the followers of Vladimir Jabotinsky (the "Revisionists") were the vanguard of Zionist aggressiveness and strident racial nationalism, but they were a minority within the Zionist movement as a whole. Revisionism had several characteristics typical of influential nineteenth-century Jewish intellectual and political movements—features shared also with other forms of traditional Judaism. Like Judaism itself and the various hermeneutic theories typical of other Jewish twentieth-century intellectual movements, the philosophy of Revisionism was a closed system that offered a complete worldview "creating a self-evident Jewish world."[86] Like the Hasidic movement and other influential Jewish intellectual and political movements, Revisionism was united around a charismatic leader figure, in this case Jabotinsky, who was seen in god-like terms—"Everyone waited for him to speak, clung to him for support, and considered him the source of the one and only absolute truth."[87] There was a powerful sense of "us versus them." Opponents were demonized: "The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

style of communication...was coarse and venomous, aimed at moral delegitimization of the opponent by denouncing him and even 'inciting' the Jewish public against him."[88]

Jabotinsky developed a form of racial nationalism similar to other Zionist racial theorists of the period (see above). He believed that Jews were shaped by their long history as a desert people and that establishment of Israel as a Jewish state would allow the natural genius of the Jewish race to flourish. "These natural and fundamental distinctions embedded in the race are impossible to eradicate, and are continually being nurtured by the differences in soil and climate."[89]

The Revisionists advocated military force as a means of obtaining a Jewish state; they wanted a "maximalist" state that would include the entire Palestine Mandate, including the Trans-Jordan (which became the nation of Jordan in 1946).[90] In the 1940s, its paramilitary wing, the Irgun, under the leadership of Menachem Begin, was responsible for much of the terrorist activities directed against both Arabs and the British forces maintaining the Palestinian Mandate until 1948, including the bombing of the King David Hotel and the massacre at Deir Yasin that was a major factor in terrorizing much of the Palestinian population into fleeing.[91]

Over time, the Labor Party has dwindled in influence, and there has followed the rise and ascendancy of the Likud Party and ultra-nationalism represented by Begin, who came to power in 1977 and began the process of resurrecting Jabotinsky,[92] by Yitzhak Shamir (commander of LEHI [the Stern Group], another pre-1948 terrorist group), and now by the government of Ariel Sharon, whose long record of aggressive brutality is described briefly below. Fundamentalists and other ultranationalists were a relatively weak phenomenon in the 1960s, but have increased to around 25% in the late 1990s and are an integral part of Sharon's government. In other words, the more radical Zionists have won out within Israel. (As Noam Chomsky notes, there has been a consensus on retaining sovereignty over the West Bank, so that the entire Israeli political spectrum must be seen as aggressively expansionist.[93] The differences are differences of degree.)

The connections between Jabotinsky and the current Israeli government are more than coincidental: Just before Israel's election in February 2001, Sharon was interviewed seated "symbolically and ostentatiously beneath a large photo of Vladimir Jabotinsky, spiritual father of militant Zionism and Sharon's Likud party. Jabotinsky called for a Jewish state extending from the Nile to the Euphrates. He advocated constant attacks to smash the weak Arab states into fragments, dominated by Israel. In fact, just what Sharon tried to do in Lebanon. Hardly a good omen for the Mideast's future."[94]

Sharon has been implicated in a long string of acts of "relentless brutality toward Arabs," including massacring an Arab village in the 1950s; the "pacification" of the Gaza Strip in the 1970s (involving large-scale bulldozing

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of homes and deportation of Palestinians); the invasion of Lebanon, which involved thousands of civilian deaths and the massacre of hundreds of Palestinian refugees; and the brutal Israeli response to the recent Palestinian intifada.[95] The Kahan Commission, an Israeli board formed to investigate the Lebanese incident, concluded that Sharon was indirectly responsible for the massacre, and it went on to say that Sharon bears personal responsibility.

The intention of the Sharon government is to make life so miserable for the Palestinians that they will voluntarily leave, or, failing that, to simply expel them. Ran HaCohen, an Israeli academic, sums up the situation as of June 2002:

> Step by step, Palestinians have been dispossessed and surrounded by settlements, military camps, by-pass roads and checkpoints, squeezed into sealed-off enclaves. Palestinian towns are besieged by tanks and armed vehicles blocking all access roads. West Bank villages too are surrounded by road blocks, preventing the movement of vehicles in and out: three successive mounds of rubble and earth, approximately 6 feet high, with 100 metre gaps between them. All residents wishing to move in and out of the village—old or young, sick or well, pregnant or not—have to climb over the slippery mounds. At present, this policy seems to have been perfected to an extent that it can be further institutionalised by long-term bureaucracy: a permit system, considerably worse than the "pass laws" imposed on blacks in Apartheid South Africa.[96]

Little has changed since this assessment. Recently this state of affairs is being formalized by the construction of a series of security walls that not only fence in the Palestinians but also result in the effective seizure of land, especially around Jerusalem.[97] The wall encircles and isolates Palestinian villages and divides properties and farmland in ways that make them inaccessible to their owners.[98]

The current state of affairs would have been absolutely predictable simply by paying attention to the pronouncements and behavior of a critical subset of Israeli leaders over the last fifty years. Again, they have been the most radical within the Israeli political spectrum. The clear message is that an important faction of the Israeli political spectrum has had a long-term policy of expanding the state at the expense of the Palestinians, dating from the beginnings of the state of Israel. Expansionism was well entrenched in the Labor Party, centered around David Ben-Gurion, and has been even more central to the Likud coalition under the leadership of Menachem Begin and, more recently, Benjamin Netanyahu and Ariel Sharon. The result is that the Palestinians have been left with little hope of obtaining a meaningful state, despite the current "road map to peace" efforts. The next step may well be expulsion, already advocated by many on the right in Israel, although the strategy of oppression is in fact causing some Palestinians to leave voluntarily.[99] Voluntary emigration has long been viewed as a solution by some, including Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin (on the more "liberal" end of the Israeli political spectrum), who urged that Israel "create...conditions which would attract natural and voluntary migration of the refugees from the Gaza Strip and the West Bank to Jordan."[100]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Transfer," whether voluntary or involuntary, has long been a fixture of Zionist thought going back to Herzl, Chaim Weizmann, and Ben-Gurion.[101] Ben-Gurion wrote in his diary in 1937: "the compulsory transfer of the Arabs from the valleys of the projected Jewish state... we have to stick to this conclusion the same way we grabbed the Balfour Declaration, more than that, the same way we grabbed at Zionism itself."[102] A prominent recent proponent of expulsion is Rehavam Zeevi, a close associate of Sharon and Israel's Minister of Tourism as well as a member of the powerful Security Cabinet until his assassination in October, 2001. Zeevi described Palestinians as "lice" and advocated the expulsion of Palestinians from Israeli-controlled areas. Zeevi said Palestinians were living illegally in Israel and "We should get rid of the ones who are not Israeli citizens the same way you get rid of lice. We have to stop this cancer from spreading within us." There are many examples, beginning no later than the mid-1980s, of leading Israeli politicians referring to the occupied territories on the West Bank as "Judea and Samaria."[103]

The point is that movements that start out on the extreme of the Jewish political spectrum eventually end up driving the entire process, so that in the end not only American Jews but pro-Israeli non-Jewish politicians end up mouthing the rhetoric that was formerly reserved for extremists within the Jewish community. In 2003, at a time when there are well over one hundred Israeli settlements on the West Bank and Gaza filled with fanatic fundamentalists and armed zealots intent on eradicating the Palestinians, it is revealing that Moshe Sharett, Israeli prime minister in the 1950s, worried that the border settlements were composed of well-armed ex-soldiers—extremists who were intent on expanding the borders of Israel. Immediately after the armistice agreement of 1948 Israeli zealots, sometimes within the army and sometimes in the nascent settler movement, began a long string of provocations of Israel's neighbors.[104] An operation of the Israeli army (under the leadership of Ariel Sharon) that demolished homes and killed civilians at Qibya in 1953 was part of a broader plan: "The stronger the tensions in the region, the more demoralized the Arab populations and destabilized the Arab regimes, the stronger the pressures for the transfer of the concentrations of Palestinian refugees from places near the border away into the interior of the Arab world—and the better it was for the preparation of the next war."[105] At times the army engaged in provocative actions without Prime Minister Sharett's knowledge,[106] as when David Ben-Gurion, Israel's first prime minister, led a raid in 1955 which resulted in a massacre of Arabs in Gaza. When confronted with his actions by an American Jew, Ben-Gurion "stood up. He looked like an angry prophet out of the Bible and got red in the face. He shouted, 'I am not going to let anybody, American Jews or anyone else, tell me what I have to do to provide for the security of my people."[107]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The war to occupy the West Bank did not take place until 1967, but Sharett describes plans by the Israeli army to occupy the West Bank dating from 1953. Throughout the period from 1948–1967 "some of the major and persistent accusations" by the Israeli right were that the Labor-dominated governments had accepted the partition of Palestine and had not attempted to "eradicate Palestinian boundaries" during the 1948 war.[108] The annexation of East Jerusalem and the settlement of the West Bank began immediately after the 1967 war—exactly what would be expected on the assumption that this was a war of conquest. Menachem Begin, who accelerated the settlement process when he assumed power in 1977, noted, "In June 1967, we again had a choice. The Egyptian Army concentrations in the Sinai approaches do not prove that [Egyptian President] Nasser was really about to attack us. We must be honest with ourselves. We decided to attack him."[109]

Given the tendency for Jewish radicals to carry the day, it is worth describing the most radical Zionist fringe as it exists now. It is common among radical Zionists to project a much larger Israel that reflects God's covenant with Abraham. Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism, maintained that the area of the Jewish state stretches: "From the Brook of Egypt to the Euphrates."[110] This reflects God's covenant with Abraham in Genesis 15: 18–20 and Joshua 1 3–4: "To your descendants I give this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river Euphrates, the land of the Kenites, the Kenizzites, the Kadmonites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Rephaim, the Amorites, the Canaanites, the Girgashites, and the Jebusites." The flexibility of the ultimate aims of Zionism can also be seen by Ben-Gurion's comment in 1936 that

> The acceptance of partition [of the Palestinian Mandate] does not commit us to renounce Transjordan [i.e., the modern state of Jordan]; one does not demand from anybody to give up his vision. We shall accept a state in the boundaries fixed today. But the boundaries of Zionist aspirations are the concern of the Jewish people and no external factor will be able to limit them.[111]

Ben-Gurion's vision of "the boundaries of Zionist aspirations" included southern Lebanon, southern Syria, all of Jordan, and the Sinai.[112] (After conquering the Sinai in 1956, Ben-Gurion announced to the Knesset that "Our army did not infringe on Egyptian territory... Our operations were restricted to the Sinai Peninsula alone."[113] Or consider Golda Meir's statement that the borders of Israel "are where Jews live, not where there is a line on the map."[114]

These views are common among the more extreme Zionists today—especially the fundamentalists and the settler movement—notably Gush Emunim—who now set the tone in Israel. A prominent rabbi associated with these movements stated: "We must live in this land even at the price of war. Moreover, even if there is peace, we must instigate wars of liberation in order to conquer [the land]."[115] Indeed, in the opinion of Israel Shahak and Norton Mezvinsky, "It is not unreasonable to assume that Gush Emunim, if it possessed the power and control, would use nuclear weapons in warfare to attempt to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

achieve its purpose."[116] This image of a "Greater Israel" is also much on the minds of activists in the Muslim world. For example, in a 1998 interview Osama bin Laden stated,

> [W]e know at least one reason behind the symbolic participation of the Western forces [in Saudi Arabia] and that is to support the Jewish and Zionist plans for expansion of what is called the Great Israel.... Their presence has no meaning save one and that is to offer support to the Jews in Palestine who are in need of their Christian brothers to achieve full control over the Arab Peninsula which they intend to make an important part of the so called Greater Israel.[117]

To recap: A century ago Zionism was a minority movement within Diaspora Judaism, with the dominant assimilationist Jews in the West opposing it at least partly because Zionism raised the old dual loyalty issue, which has been a potent source of anti-Semitism throughout the ages. The vast majority of Jews eventually became Zionists, to the point that now not only are Diaspora Jews Zionists, they are indispensable supporters of the most fanatic elements within Israel. Within Israel, the radicals have also won the day, and the state has evolved to the point where the influence of moderates in the tradition of Moshe Sharett is a distant memory. The fanatics keep pushing the envelope, forcing other Jews to either go along with their agenda or to simply cease being part of the Jewish community. Not long ago it was common to talk to American Jews who would say they support Israel but deplore the settlements. Now such talk among Jews is an anachronism, because support for Israel demands support for the settlements. The only refuge for such talk is the increasingly isolated Jewish critics of Israel, such as Israel Shamir[118] and, to a much lesser extent, Michael Lerner's *Tikkun*.[119] The trajectory of Zionism has soared from its being a minority within a minority to its dominating the U.S. Congress, the executive branch, and the entire U.S. foreign policy apparatus.

And because the Israeli occupation and large-scale settlement of the West Bank unleashed a wave of terrorist-style violence against Israel, Jews perceive Israel as under threat. As with any committed group, Jewish commitment increases in times of perceived threat to the community. The typical response of Diaspora Jews to the recent violence has not been to renounce Jewish identity but to strongly support the Sharon government and rationalize its actions. This has been typical of Jewish history in general. For example, during the 1967 and 1973 wars there were huge upsurges of support for Israel and strengthened Jewish identity among American Jews: Arthur Hertzberg, a prominent Zionist, wrote that "the immediate reaction of American Jewry to the crisis was far more intense and widespread than anyone could have foreseen. Many Jews would never have believed that grave danger to Israel could dominate their thoughts and emotions to the exclusion of everything else."[120] The same thing is happening now. The typical response to Israel's current situation is for Jews to identify even more strongly with Israel and to exclude Jews who criticize Israel or support Palestinian claims in any way.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This "rallying around the flag" in times of crisis fits well with the psychology of ethnocentrism: When under attack, groups become more unified and more conscious of boundaries, and have a greater tendency to form negative stereotypes of the outgroup. This has happened throughout Jewish history.[121]

Several commentators have noted the void on the Jewish left as the conflict with the Palestinians has escalated under the Sharon government. As noted above, surveys in the 1980s routinely found that half of U.S. Jews opposed settlements on the West Bank and favored a Palestinian state.[122] Such sentiments have declined precipitously in the current climate:

> At a progressive synagogue on Manhattan's Upper West Side, Rabbi Rolando Matalo was torn between his longtime support for Palestinian human rights and his support for an Israel under siege. "There is a definite void on the left," said Matalo…. Many American Jewish leaders say Israel's current state of emergency—and growing signs of anti-Semitism around the world—have unified the faithful here in a way not seen since the 1967 and 1973 wars…. These feelings shift back and forth, but right now they're tilting toward tribalism.[123]

Note that the author of this article, Josh Getlin, portrays Israel as being "under siege," even though Israel is the occupying power and has killed far more Palestinians than the Palestinians have killed Israelis.

> "I don't recall a time in modern history when Jews have felt so vulnerable," said Rabbi Martin Hier, dean and founder of the Simon Wiesenthal Center in Los Angeles.... This week, the center will be mailing out 600,000 "call to action" brochures that say "Israel is fighting for her life" and urge American Jews to contact government leaders and media organizations worldwide.... Rabbi Mark Diamond, executive vice president of the Board of Rabbis of Southern California, said debate over the West Bank invasion and the attack on the Palestinian Jenin refugee camp is overshadowed by "a strong sense that Israel needs us, that the world Jewry needs us, that this is our wake-up call." He said he has been overwhelmed in recent weeks by numerous calls from members of synagogues asking what they can do to help or where they can send a check.... "I have American friends who might have been moderate before on the issue of negotiating peace, but now they think: 'Our whole survival is at stake, so let's just destroy them all,'" said Victor Nye, a Brooklyn, N.Y., businessman who describes himself as a passionate supporter of Israel.

In this atmosphere, Jews who dissent are seen as traitors, and liberal Jews have a great deal of anxiety that they will be ostracized from the Jewish community for criticizing Israel.[124] This phenomenon is not new. During the 1982 invasion of Lebanon, Richard Cohen of the *Washington Post* criticized the Begin government and was inundated with protests from Jews. "Here dissent becomes treason—and treason not to a state or even an ideal (Zionism), but to a people. There is tremendous pressure for conformity, to show a united front and to adopt the view that what is best for Israel is something only the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government there can know."[125] During the same period, Nat Hentoff noted in the *Village Voice*, "I know staff workers for the American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress who agonize about their failure to speak out, even on their own time, against Israeli injustice. They don't, because they figure they'll get fired if they do."[126]

Reflecting the fact that Jews who advocate peace with the Palestinians are on the defensive, funding has dried up for causes associated with criticism of Israel. The following is a note posted on the website of *Tikkun* by its editor, Michael Lerner:

> *TIKKUN Magazine* is in trouble—because we have continued to insist on the rights of the Palestinian people to full self-determination. For years we've called for an end to the Occupation and dismantling of the Israeli settlements. We've called on the Palestinian people to follow the example of Martin Luther King, Jr., Nelson Mandela and Gandhi—and we've critiqued terrorism against Israel, and insisted on Israel's right to security. But we've also critiqued Israel's house demolitions, torture, and grabbing of land. For years, we had much support. But since Intifada II began this past September, many Jews have stopped supporting us—and we've lost subscribers and donors. Would you consider helping us out?"[127]

Another sign that Jews who are "soft" on Israel are being pushed out of the Jewish community is an article by Philip Weiss.[128]

> The refusal of liberal American Jews to make an independent stand has left the American left helpless. American liberalism has always drawn strength from Jews. They are among the largest contributors to the Democratic Party; they have brought a special perspective to any number of social-justice questions, from the advancement of blacks and women to free speech. They fostered multiculturalism.... The Holocaust continues to be the baseline reference for Jews when thinking about their relationship to the world, and the Palestinians. A couple of months ago, I got an e-mail from a friend of a friend in Israel about the latest bus-bombing. "They're going to kill us all," was the headline. (No matter that Israel has one of largest armies in the world, and that many more Palestinians have died than Israelis). Once, when I suggested to a liberal journalist friend that Americans had a right to discuss issues involving Jewish success in the American power structure—just as we examined the WASP culture of the establishment a generation ago—he said, "Well, we know where that conversation ends up: in the ovens of Auschwitz."

Because of Jewish ethnocentrism and group commitment, stories of Jews being killed are seen as the portending of another Holocaust and the extinction of the Jewish people rather than a response to a savage occupation—a clear instance of moral particularism writ large.

The same thing is happening in Canada where Jews are concerned about declining support by Canadians for Israel. "The past three years have been extraordinarily tough on Jews in Canada and around the world," said Keith Landy, national president of the Canadian Jewish Congress. "Every Jew has felt under attack in some form."[129] The response has been increased activism by deeply committed wealthy Jews, including, most famously, Israel Aper, executive chairman of CanWest Global Communications Corp. Aper has used his media empire to promote pro-Likud policies and has punished journalists for any

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deviation from its strong pro-Israel editorial policies.[130] The efforts of these activists are aimed at consolidating Jewish organizations behind "hawkish" attitudes on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Older Jewish organizations, such as the Canada-Israel Committee and the Canadian Jewish Congress, would be remolded or driven out of existence to exclude Jews less committed to these attitudes.

Conclusion

An important mechanism underlying all this is that of rallying around the flag during times of crisis, a phenomenon that is well understood by social psychologists. Group identification processes are exaggerated in times of resource competition or other perceived sources of threat,[131] a finding that is highly compatible with an evolutionary perspective.[132] External threat tends to reduce internal divisions and maximize perceptions of common interest among ingroup members, as we have seen among American Jews in response to perceived crises in Israel, ranging from the Six-Day War of 1967 to the unending crises of the 1990s and into the new millennium.[133] Jewish populations also respond to threat by developing messianic ideologies, rallying around charismatic leaders, and expelling dissenters from the community. Traditionally this has taken the form of religious fundamentalism, as among the Hasidim, but in the modern world these tendencies have been manifested in various forms of leftist radicalism, Zionism, and other Jewish intellectual and political movements.[134] Throughout Jewish history, this siege mentality has tended to increase conflict between Jews and non-Jews. In the context of the intense ethnic conflict of nineteenth-century Eastern Europe, the conflict was exacerbated by an enormous increase in the Jewish population.

And in all cases, the leaders of this process are the more ethnocentric, committed Jews. They are the ones who donate to Jewish causes, attend rallies, write letters, join and support activist organizations. As J. J. Goldberg, the editor of the *Forward*, notes, Jews who identify themselves as doves feel much less strongly about Israel than those who identify themselves as hawks. "Jewish liberals give to the Sierra Fund. Jewish conservatives are Jewish all the time. That's the whole ball game. It's not what six million American Jews feel is best — it's what 50 Jewish organizations feel is best."[135] In other words, it's the most radical, committed elements of the Jewish community that determine the direction of the entire community.

As a European in a society that is rapidly becoming non-European, I can sympathize with Jabotinsky's envy of the native Slavic peoples he observed in the early twentieth century:

> I look at them with envy. I have never known, and probably never will know, this completely organic feeling: so united and singular [is this] sense of a homeland, in which everything flows together, the past and the present, the legend and the hopes, the individual and the historical.[136]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> Every nation civilised or primitive, sees its land as its national home, where it wants to stay as the sole landlord forever. Such a nation will never willingly consent to new landlords or even to partnership.[137]

It is the memory of this rapidly disappearing sense of historical rootedness and sense of impending dispossession that are at the root of the malaise experienced by many Europeans, not only in the U.S. but elsewhere. The triumph of Zionism took a mere fifty years from Herzl's inspiration to the founding of the state of Israel. There is a tendency to overlook or ignore the powerful ethnocentrism at the heart of Zionism that motivated people like Jabotinsky, especially on the part of the American Jewish community, which has been dedicated throughout the twentieth century to pathologizing and criminalizing the fragile vestiges of ethnocentrism among Europeans.[138]

But the bottom line is that the Zionists were successful. Israel would not have become a state without a great many deeply ethnocentric Jews willing to engage in any means necessary to bring about their dream: a state that would be a vehicle for their ethnic interests. It would not have come about without the most radical among them—people like Jabotinsky, Begin, Shamir, Sharon, and their supporters—a group which now includes the entire organized American Jewish community. The impending dispossession of Europeans will only be avoided if people of their ilk can be found among the political class of Europeans.

The final paper in this series will discuss neo-conservatism as a Jewish intellectual and political movement. A main point of that paper will be that Jewish neo-conservatives are the current radicals who are charting the direction of the entire Jewish community.

Kevin MacDonald is Professor of Psychology, California State University – Long Beach, and the author of a trilogy on Judaism as an evolutionary strategy: ***A People That Shall Dwell Alone (1994)****,* ***Separation and its Discontents (1998)****, and* ***The Culture of Critique (1998)****, all published by Praeger 1994-1998. A revised edition of* ***The Culture of Critique*** *(2002), with an expanded introduction, is available in a quality soft cover edition from www.1stBooks.com or www.amazon.com.*

References

References to the Book of Jubilees are from *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament II*, ed. R. H. Charles, 1–82. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, [1913] 1966.

References to the Book of Maccabees are to *The New English Bible: The Apocrypha*. London: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Alderman, G. (1983). *The Jewish Community in British Politics*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alexander, R. (1979). *Darwinism and Human Affairs.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Aruri, N. H. (1986). Preface to this edition. In L. Rokach, *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, 3rd edition. Belmont, MA: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc.

Aschheim, S. E. (1982). *Brothers and Strangers: The East European Jew in Germany and German Jewish Consciousness, 1800–1923.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bendersky, J. W. (2000). *The "Jewish Threat": Anti-Semitic Politics of the U.S. Army.* New York: Basic Books.

Bookman, M. Z. (1997). *The Demographic Struggle for Power: The Political Economy of Demographic Engineering in the Modern World*. London and Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass.

Brubacher, M. (2002). From war on terror to plain war. Israel: Walled in, but never secure. *Le Monde diplomatique*, November.

Chomsky, N. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel and the Palestinians*, 2nd ed. Boston: South End Press.

Cockburn, A. (2002). No respite for West Bank locals. *National Geographic:* http://magma.nationalgeographic.com/ngm/0210/feature5/online_extra.html.

Cohen, N. W. (1972). *Not Free to Desist: The American Jewish Committee 1906–1966.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.

Dawidowicz, L. (1976). *A Holocaust Reader*. New York: Behrman.

Efron, J. M. (1994). *Defenders of the Race: Jewish Doctors and Race Science in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Endelman, T. M. (1991). The legitimization of the diaspora experience in recent Jewish historiography. *Modern Judaism* 11:195–209.

Findley, P. (1989). *They Dare to Speak Out: People and Institutions Confront Israel's Lobby*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books.

Frankel, J. (1981). *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frommer, M. (1978). The American Jewish Congress: A history 1914–1950, 2 vols. Ph.D. Dissertation, Ohio State University.

Getlin, J. (2002). Violence in Mideast galvanizes U.S. Jews. *Los Angeles Times,* April 28.

Gilbar, G. (1997). *Population Dilemmas in the Middle East: Essays in Political Demography and Economy*. London and Portland, Oregon: Frank Cass.

Gilman, S. L. (1993). *Freud, Race, and Gender*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Goldmann, N. (1978). *The Jewish Paradox.* New York: Fred Jordan Books/Grosset & Dunlap.

HaCohen, R. (2002). Palestinian enslavement entering a new phase. www.antiwar.com. May 24.

Hertzberg, A. (1979). *Being Jewish in America*. New York: Schocken Books.

Herzl, T. (1970). *The Jewish State*, trans. H. Zohn. New York: Herzl Press.

Herzl, T. (1960). Complete Diaries, vol. II, p. 711.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology* 53:575–604.

Hitler, A. (1943). *Mein Kampf*, trans. R. Manheim. Boston: Houghton Mifflin; originally published 1925–1926.

Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1987). *Social Identifications.* New York: Routledge.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

John, R., & Hadawi, S. (1970a). *The Palestine Diary, 1914–1945: Britain's Involvement.* New York: The New World Press.

John, R., & Hadawi, S. (1970b). *The Palestine Diary, 1945–1948: United States, United Nations Intervention.* New York: The New World Press.

Johnson, G. (1995). The evolutionary origins of government and politics. In *Human Nature and Politics*, ed. J. Losco & A. Somit. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Keller, B. (2002). The sunshine warrior. *New York Times Magazine*, September 23.

Kornberg, R. (1993). *Theodore Herzl: From Assimilation to Zionism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Laqueur, W. (1972). *A History of Zionism.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Lilienthal, A. M. (1953). *What Price Israel?* Chicago: Henry Regnery Co.

Lilienthal, A. M. (1978). *The Zionist Connection: What Price Peace?* New York: Dodd, Mead.

Lindemann, A. S. (1991). *The Jew Accused: Three Anti-Semitic Affairs (Dreyfus, Beilis, Frank) 1894–1915.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lindemann, A. S. (1997). *Esau's Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

MacDonald, K. B. (1994/2002). *A People That Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism As a Group Evolutionary Strategy, with Diaspora Peoples.* Lincoln, NE: iUniverse. Originally published in 1994 by Praeger (Westport, CT).

MacDonald, K. B. (1997). Life history theory and human reproductive behavior: Environmental/contextual influences and heritable variation. *Human Nature* 8:327–359.

MacDonald, K. B. (1998a). *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

MacDonald, K. B. (1998b/2002). *The Culture of Critique:: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements*. Bloomington, IN: 1stBooks Library. Originally published in 1998 by Praeger (Westport, CT).

MacDonald, K. B. (2000). Book Review Essay: The numbers game: Ethnic conflict in the contemporary world. *Population and Environment* 21:413–425.

MacDonald, K. B. (2002). What makes Western culture unique? *The Occidental Quarterly* 2(2):8–38.

MacDonald, K. B. (2003). Understanding Jewish activism I: Background traits for Jewish activism. *Occidental Quarterly* 2(3):5–38.

Mahler, R. (1985). *Hasidism and the Jewish Enlightenment: Their Confrontation in Galicia and Poland in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.

Masalha, N. (1992). *Expulsion of the Palestinians: The Concept of "Transfer" in Zionist Political Thought, 1882–1948.* Washington, DC: Institute for Palestine Studies.

Massing, M. (2002). Deal breakers, *American Prospect*, March 11.

Meyer, M. A. (1988). *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Neusner, J. (1987). *Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine: History, Messiah, Israel, and the Initial Confrontation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nicosia, F. R. (1985). *The Third Reich and the Palestine Question.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Niewyk, D. L. (1980). *The Jews in Weimar Germany*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Norden, E. (1995). An unsung Jewish prophet. *Commentary* 99(4):37–43.

Novick, P. (1999). *The Holocaust in American Life.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Parsons, J. (1998). *Human Population Competition. A Study of the Pursuit of Power through Numbers*. Lewiston, NY & Lampeter, Wales: The Edwin Mellen Press.

Podhoretz, N. (2002). In praise of the Bush doctrine. *Commentary*, September.

Prinz, J. (1934). *Wir Juden*. Berlin: Erich Press.

Rokach, L. (1986). *Israel's Sacred Terrorism*, 3rd edition. Belmont, MA: Association of Arab-American University Graduates, Inc. Originally published 1980.

Ross, O. (2003). Power struggle crisis worries Jewish groups. *Toronto Star*, October 4.

Rubenstein, J. (1996). *Tangled Loyalties: The Life and Times of Ilya Ehrenburg.* New York: Basic Books.

Ruppin, A. (1971). *Arthur Ruppin: Memoirs, Diaries, Letters*, ed. A. Bein, trans. K. Gershon. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Sachar, H. M. (1992). *A History of Jews in America.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Sacks, J. (1993). *One People? Tradition, Modernity, and Jewish Unity*. London: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Salter, F. K. (2002a). Fuzzy but real: America's ethnic hierarchy. Paper presented at the meetings of the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences, Montreal, August 9.

Salter, F. K. (Ed.) (2002b). *Risky Transactions*. London: Berghan.

Schatz, J. (1991). *The Generation: The Rise and Fall of the Jewish Communists of Poland.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Shahak, I. (1993). Relations between Israel and organized American Jews. *Middle East Policy Council Journal, 2(3)*. http://www.mepc.org/public_asp/journal_shahak/shahak45.asp.

Shahak, I. (1994). *Jewish History, Jewish Religion: The Weight of Three Thousand Years.* Boulder, CO: Pluto Press.

Shahak, I., & Mezvinsky, N. (1999). *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel.* London: Pluto Press.

Shavit, Y. (1988). *Jabotinsky and the Revisionist Movement, 1925–1948.* London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.

Teitelbaum, M. S., & Winter, J. (1998). *A Question of Numbers: High Migration, Low Fertility, and the Politics of National Identity.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Vaksberg, A. (1994). *Stalin against the Jews*, trans. A. W. Bouis. New York: Knopf.

Vital, D. (1975). *The Origins of Zionism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University, The Clarendon Press.

Weiss, P. (2002). Holy or unholy, Jews and right in an alliance, *New York Observer*, September 19.

Wheatcroft, G. (1996). *The Controversy of Zion: Jewish Nationalism, the Jewish State, and the Unresolved Jewish Dilemma.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Endnotes

1. MacDonald 2003.
2. Podhoretz 2002.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Sacks 1993, ix–x.
4. 1 Maccabees 1:11–15; http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/apo/011
5. Jubilees 32:18–19.
6. MacDonald 1994/2003, Ch. 3.
7. Meyer, 1988, 388.
8. MacDonald 1994/2002, Ch. 5.
9. See MacDonald 1998/2002, preface to the paperback edition.
10. Alderman 1992, 112; Frankel 1981, 103; Lindemann 1991, 28–29, 133–135.
11. E.g., For example, Scholem 1971; MacDonald 1994/2002, Ch. 3.
12. Lewis 1984, 164.
13. Aschheim 1982.
14. MacDonald 1998/2002, especially Ch. 3.
15. MacDonald 1997, 2002.
16. See MacDonald (1998/2002), 2003.
17. Bookman 1997; Teitelbaum & Winter 1997; Parsons, 1998; MacDonald, 2000.
18. Bookman 1997, 89.
19. Bookman 1997; MacDonald 2000.
20. Vital 1975, 28.
21. The following relies on Mahler 1985.
22. Vital 1975, 46.
23. Mahler 1985, 16.
24. Mahler 1985, 17.
25. Mahler 1985, 17.
26. MacDonald 2003; Shahak & Mezvinsky 1999, 58–60.
27. MacDonald 1998/2002.
28. Ruppin 1971, 69.
29. In Mahler 1985, 8.
30. In Mahler 1985, 249.
31. Mahler 1985, 251.
32. MacDonald 1998/2002.
33. Shahak & Mezvinsky 1999, 37.
34. In Mahler 1985, 21.
35. In Mahler 1985, 21.
36. See summary in MacDonald 1998/2004.
37. Lindemann 1991, 17.
38. Vital 1975, 65ff.
39. Vital 1975, 314.
40. See Frankel 1981.
41. Alderman 1983, 47ff; MacDonald 1998/2002, Ch. 3.
42. Alderman 1983, 60; MacDonald 1998/2004, Ch. 8.
43. MacDonald 1998/2002, Ch. 3; Vital 1975, 313.
44. Vital 1975, 117.
45. Kornberg 1993, 183; inner quote from Herzl's diary.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

46. Niewyk 1980, 94.
47. In Frommer 1978, 118.
48. In Lilienthal 1953, 165.
49. Endelman 1991, 196.
50. Herzl 1970, 76.
51. In Neusner 1987, 203.
52. Efron 1994; Endelman 1991, 196.
53. Efron 1994, 136.
54. Efron 1994, 155.
55. Gilman 1993, 109; Nicosia 1985, 18.
56. See Efron 1994, 158.
57. Norden, 1995.
58. In Niewyk 1980, 129–130
59. Prinz 1934; in Shahak 1994, 71–72; italics in text.
60. Nicosia 1985, 19.
61. In Dawidowicz 1976, 150–152.
62. Salter 2002b.
63. Laqueur 1972; Vital 1975.
64. Frommer 1978; Alderman 1983
65. Laqueur 1972, 196; see also John & Hadawi 1970a, 80.
66. Laqueur 1972, 546, 549; Wheatcroft 1996, 98–147; The Columbus Platform: "Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism" (1937); reprinted in Meyer 1988, 389.
67. Meyer 1988, 339.
68. Hitler 1943, 56.
69. Ibid., 57.
70. Schatz 1991, 375n.13.
71. Vaksberg 1994, 197.
72. Rubenstein 1996, 260.
73. Sachar 1992, 256ff.
74. Alderman 1983, 129.
75. In Alderman 1983, 151.
76. Goldmann 1978, 31; Lilienthal 1978, 50, 61; Sachar 1992, 580.
77. Sachar 1992, 597.
78. In Cohen 1972, 325.
79. Regarding Truman's attitudes toward Jews, see "Harry Truman's Forgotten Diary: 1947 Writings Offer Fresh Insight on the President," *Washington Post*, July 11, 2003, p. A1; http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A40678-2003Jul10.html
80. Bendersky 2000, 325.
81. Ibid., 328; John & Hadawi 1970a, 357.
82. Wheatcroft 1996, 226.
83. Novick 1999, 155.
84. Shahak 1993.
85. Ibid.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

86. Shavit 1988, 23.
87. Ibid., 67.
88. Shavit 1988, 80.
89. In Shavit 1988, 112.
90. John & Hadawi 1970a, 249.
91. Ibid., 351. John & Hadawi 1970b, 329.
92. M. Bruzonsky, "The Mentor Who Shaped Begin's Thinking: Jabotinsky," *Washington Post*, Outlook Section, Sunday, Nov. 16, 1980.
93. Chomsky 1999, 54.
94. E. Margolis, "Sharon Won the Battle, but Does It Mean More War?" *Toronto Sun*, Feb. 11, 2001.
95. *Ibid.*
96. HaCohen 2002.
97. Brubacher 2002.
98. "U.S. May Punish Israel for Building Fence in W. Bank," *Los Angeles Times*, August 5, 2003.
99. Cockburn 2002.
100. In Chomsky 1999, 116.
101. Chomsky 1999, 117; Masalha 1992.
102. In Masalha 1992, 210.
103. Aruri 1986
104. Chomsky 1999, 101.
105. Rokach 1986.
106. Wheatcroft 1996, 249.
107. In Findley 1989, 277.
108. Shavit 1988, 243.
109. Chomsky 1999, 100; see also http://www.cactus48.com/truth.html.
110. Herzl 1960, 711.
111. Chomsky 1999, 161; see also http://www.cactus48.com/truth.html.
112. In Chomsky 1999, 161.
113. In Chomsky 1999, 161.
114. In Chomsky 1999, 50.
115. In Shahak & Mezvinsky 1999, 73.
116. *Ibid.*, 73.
117.http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/binladen/who/interview.html
118. http://www.israelshamir.net/
119. www.israelshamir.net ; www.Tikkun.com
120. Hertzberg 1979, 210.
121. MacDonald 1998a, Ch. 1.
122. Findley 1989, 265.
123. Getlin 2002.
124. Ibid.
125. In Findley 1989, 269.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

126. In Findley 1989, 271.
127. www.Tikkun.com, September 2002.
128. Weiss 2002.
129. O. Ross, 2003. Power struggle crisis worries Jewish groups. *Toronto Star*, October 4, 2003.
130. See MacDonald, 2003.
131. Hogg & Abrams 1987; Hewstone, Rubin & Willis 2002.
132. MacDonald 1998a.
133. Alexander 1979.
134. MacDonald 1998b/2002.
135. In Massing 2002.
136. In Shavit 1988, 116.
137. In Wheatcroft 1996, 207.
138. MacDonald 1998/2002.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE REALITY OF RED SUBVERSION:

THE RECENT CONFIRMATION OF SOVIET ESPIONAGE IN AMERICA

STEPHEN J. SNIEGOSKI

In an apparent effort to illustrate political simple-mindedness, Carroll Quigley derisively wrote in his noted (at least by the John Birch Society) *Tragedy and Hope*, that the "same groups who were howling about Soviet espionage in 1948-1955 were also claiming that President Roosevelt expected and wanted Pearl Harbor."[1] In a previous contribution to *The Occidental Quarterly*, I dealt with the latter; here I will do some "howling" about the former. According to what until recently has passed as conventional wisdom for the liberal establishment, America in the late 1940s and early 1950s was gripped by a terrible Red scare, a period of anti-Communist hysteria and witch hunts. Malicious "red-baiters" slandered innocent liberals as Communists in order to destroy the reforms of the New Deal and impede peace with the Soviet Union. At most, some of the more "anti-Communist" liberals would concede that there may have been a few Communist subversives, but nothing to justify the terrible anti-Communist overreaction, above all the antics of the demagogic Joe McCarthy. From the 1960s through the 1980s, one of the strongest taboos in American political discourse was the subject of Soviet influence within the United States.

During the 1990s, the release of the Venona documents (see p. 49) by the U.S. government and the partial opening of the Soviet archives forced establishment minds to a reconsideration. Yes, Virginia, there really were Communist spies in the United States during the so-called "McCarthy era." In fact, it now appears that even the slandered and smeared "red-baiters" of the period were unaware of just how far Soviet Communist subversion had penetrated. It must be added that even during the period of the so-called "witch hunt" there was more than enough evidence to prove the reality of Soviet Communist spying to any objective person. But, of course, if one is going to pass for an "educated," "respectable" person, objective thinking must be eschewed—it's simply not a Darwinian survival trait in modern America.

From Lenin onward Soviet Communist leaders have preached the necessity of underground activities, with foreign governments the key target for infiltration. The evidence for this from many countries is overwhelming. Communists in government engaged in espionage and acted to influence policy in a pro-Soviet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direction. Many of the individuals engaged in these activities were Communist Party members; others were fellow travelers, who despite their lack of party discipline, sought to advance the interests of Soviet Communism.

Franklin Roosevelt's diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union in 1933 provided the Soviets with their first opportunity for effective penetration of the U.S. government. With diplomatic recognition, Soviet intelligence could function under legal cover through its embassy and consulates. The liberal New Deal agencies provided a fertile field for the recruitment of Soviet spies. Many of those who staffed these agencies sympathized with the government planning of the Soviet "experiment" and with Soviet opposition to fascism. This sympathy for Communism increased during World War II, when the Soviets could be seen as comrades-in-arms. That the Soviet Union was combating the great evil of Nazism has often been used to explain (and to justify) the disproportionate number of subversives of Jewish ethnicity.

Soviet intelligence benefited immensely from the support of the Communist Party of the United States, many of whose members acted as agents. Thus during the 1930s and 1940s, Communist subversives, under direct Soviet control, came to permeate key agencies of the federal government: the Treasury and State departments, the Office of Strategic Services (forerunner to the CIA), and even the White House itself.

Soviet intelligence consisted of three separate organizations: the KGB (NKVD or NKGB—the leading state security organ),[2] the GRU (military intelligence), and the U.S. Communist Party (technically, the Communist Party of the United States of America, or CPUSA), which was supervised by the Comintern (the Communist International, run by Stalin). The KGB and GRU ran parallel "legal" and "illegal" intelligence networks in the United States. "Legal" networks were run by intelligence officers working under legal, usually diplomatic, cover in "residencies" located clandestinely in Soviet diplomatic missions and other official organizations. "Illegal" networks, in contrast, were run by Soviet intelligence officers who used false identities and had no apparent connection to Soviet organizations.

President Roosevelt was oblivious to the danger of Soviet subversion. In 1939, Adolf A. Berle, Roosevelt's assistant secretary of state and adviser on internal security, presented the President with a list of leading Soviet agents in the United States, including Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White, after receiving this information from ex-Communist spy Whittaker Chambers. Roosevelt simply laughed this off as ridiculous.[3]

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, however, was concerned about Communist infiltration of the government, and the Nazi-Soviet pact provided him with the opportunity to move against suspected Soviet agents. In 1939 FBI special agents raided the facilities of several organizations linked to the U.S. Communist Party and arrested General Secretary Earl Browder on charges of passport fraud. In

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

April 1941, the FBI arrested the senior KGB officer in the United States, Gaik Ovakimian, for violating the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The German invasion of the Soviet Union in June 1941 caused the U.S. government to halt this early FBI effort to counter Soviet subversion quickly. Ovakimian was allowed to leave the country and President Roosevelt commuted Browder's sentence.[4]

Although the United States had enacted a number of laws and regulations proscribing Communists from the federal government, during World War II these were only loosely enforced. Members of the Roosevelt administration did not distinguish between support for the Soviet effort to defeat the Axis and support for Soviet Communism. They seemed to believe their own war propaganda: Since Stalin was fighting Nazism, Stalin and the Soviet Union must be beneficent. While some of this cooperation with the Soviet Union was open, other aspects took place behind the scenes. For example, the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) actually cooperated with the KGB. OSS Director William Donovan made an effort to establish a formal exchange with the KGB, which would have included allowing an official KGB mission in the United States. Donovan was not pro-Communist, but was entranced by wartime and postwar collaboration with the Soviet Union. Donovan's proposal had considerable support in the ranks of the Roosevelt administration. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, however, was adamantly opposed. Roosevelt ultimately rejected the proposal in March 1944 for political reasons, fearing conservative Republican attacks abetted by Hoover. As historian Bradley F. Smith writes, what motivated Roosevelt in rejecting the exchange was "not distrust of the Soviet secret policy but apprehension about what Hoover and his conservative friends might do." The decision represented "less a fear of communists than of anti-communists."[5] Despite the failure to establish a formal exchange, informal cooperation developed between the OSS and the KGB, which involved the exchange of a broad range of highly classified material. It should be added that that OSS was also infiltrated by a substantial number of Soviet Communist agents.

U.S. cooperation with the Soviet Union demonstrated the intellectual obtuseness of the American leadership. While America was preaching a war for freedom and railing about Nazi barbarities, it was in bed with a government that maintained an absolute tyranny and killed millions of people. And even if morality could be discounted, it was apparent that Soviet Communism never intended to be friendly with the United States, but openly called for a Communist-controlled world—a "World Federation of Socialist Soviet Republics." The Soviets were not fighting the war to protect Western capitalist democracy but rather to protect and expand Soviet Communist interests. In fact, Stalin deliberately sought to bring about war in 1939 because he, like other Communists, expected a prolonged war to facilitate revolution in an exhausted Europe, as had been the case in World War I.[6]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Wartime propaganda in the United States, directed by the Office of War Information (which many in the government actually seemed to believe), presented Stalinist Russia as a beneficent country that was a true friend of the United States. Vice President Henry Wallace even portrayed Stalin's "economic democracy" as superior in important ways to the "political or Bill-of-Rights democracy" of the United States, which brought about "exploitation, impracticable emphasis on states' rights and even…anarchy."[7] Given the widespread admiration for Soviet Communism, it can be well understood how Soviet spies could freely operate in the federal government and not appear substantially different from those Americans, especially liberals, who simply wanted to help their Soviet allies during the war and extend that cooperation into the postwar era.

As American hostility toward the Soviet Union began to develop at the end of the war in 1945, evidence of Communist influence in the government came to be looked upon in a more negative light. Simultaneously, evidence of Communist penetration mounted rapidly. In February 1945, federal officials found numerous classified government documents, some marked "top secret," in the New York office of the pro-Communist journal *Amerasia* (see p. 61). Later, former Soviet Communist agents Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers told their stories of Communist espionage to the FBI. And in September 1945, a cipher clerk at the Soviet embassy in Ottawa, Igor Gouzenko, defected to Canadian authorities, bringing documentary proof of the existence of a far-flung Soviet spy apparatus that had penetrated the Manhattan Project and other agencies in the American, British, and Canadian governments. Ottawa quickly conveyed this information to Washington. Significantly, the stories of subversion from the various sources fitted together.

By the latter part of 1945, the White House was aware of accusations against a substantial number of U.S. government employees, including such high officials as the State Department's Alger Hiss, White House aide Lauchlin Currie, OSS executive assistant Duncan Lee, and Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White. Although the Truman administration was alarmed by these revelations, it only slowly began to take action. This sluggishness stemmed largely from political concerns. Undoubtedly, the natural reaction of a politician would be to keep such skeletons locked in the closet—and Truman and his closest associates were fearful of public scandals that might discredit the Democratic Party and its policies and thereby bring the Republicans into power. In short, Truman put domestic politics above American security.

Examples of the Truman administration's inaction and cover-up included deliberate efforts within the Justice Department to bury the *Amerasia* case.[8] And, despite receiving an FBI report on Harry Dexter White's subversive activities, Truman in 1946 nominated White as American representative to the International Monetary Fund.[9]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Republican charges of Communists in government, which helped them win control of Congress in the 1946 election, induced Truman to take action. In an effort to control the subversion issue and prevent congressional investigations that might benefit the Republicans, Truman issued Executive Order 9835 in March 1947, which instituted loyalty and security checks in the government. Truman believed the executive branch alone could effectively prevent Soviet subversion, and he used the executive order to restrict congressional access to security information.[10]

Even after initiating the executive order, however, Truman refused to acknowledge the immense scope of Soviet subversion. Thus, in 1948, Truman characterized the House Un-American Activities Committee's investigation of Alger Hiss as a "Red Herring." And Truman would write in his memoirs in 1956, "The country had reason to be proud of and have confidence in our security agencies. They had kept us almost totally free of sabotage and espionage during the war."[11]

But while Truman publicly downplayed the scope of Soviet infiltration, the U.S. government had an additional secret source of information that showed the vast extent of this Soviet enterprise. This was the Venona Project. "Venona" was the top-secret name given by the U. S. government to an extensive program launched in 1943 to intercept and decipher communications between Moscow and its intelligence stations in the West. Most of the messages were decoded and read between 1947 and 1952, though the effort continued until 1980. While 200,000 messages were intercepted, only a small number were ever deciphered, and the whole effort was kept top secret for years. While Venona's existence became publicly known in the early 1980s,[12] it was not until 1995 that the National Security Agency began releasing the documents to the public, and fewer than 3,000 partially or fully decrypted Venona messages have been declassified. Venona corroborated stories that the U.S. government was heavily infiltrated by Soviet espionage agents. However, because Venona was a totally secret operation, no evidence obtained from its intercepts was ever introduced in any court, since Washington considered Venona's secrecy to be more important than jailing Soviet agents.

The first comprehensive examination of the subject is *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America*, authored by two establishment historians of American Communism, John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr.[13] Haynes, Twentieth Century Political Historian at the Library of Congress, and Klehr, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of Politics and History at Emory University, are coauthors of other works in Yale University's "Annals of Communism" series.[14]

Haynes and Klehr maintain that Venona conclusively shows that the U.S. Communist Party "was indeed a fifth column working inside and against the United States in the cold war,"[15] and that most of those individuals accused of aiding the Soviets in the 1940s had actually done so. The authors point out that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Venona not only supplied information through its intercepts of Soviet traffic, but, because of its "inherent reliability," also provided a "touchstone for judging the credibility of other sources, such as defectors' testimony and FBI investigative files."[16]

Venona decrypts revealed that Soviet spies had infiltrated every major agency of the U.S. government during the war years, from the State and Treasury departments to the Manhattan Project. Venona confirmed the guilt of the atomic spies Klaus Fuchs, Theodore Hall, and Julius Rosenberg. Among the high government officials identified by Venona as Soviet agents were State Department official Alger Hiss; Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Harry Dexter White; the chief of the State Department's Division of American Republics, Laurence Duggan; the head of the OSS research department, Maurice Halperin; the special assistant to the director of the OSS, Duncan Lee; and White House aide Lauchlin Currie. However, the authors acknowledge that while Venona demonstrated the Soviet penetration of the United States, it was less valuable in showing the actual damage that Soviet spies did to American security. This stems from the fact that very little information of a substantive nature went by cable to Moscow; the bulk of the espionage reports, including stolen documents, traveling by courier.[17]

The demise of the Soviet Union also has brought additional information on the Soviet penetration of America. This has come from Soviet intelligence officials themselves and from the partial opening of the Soviet archives in the early 1990s. Former Soviet intelligence officials who have authored books include defector Colonel Oleg Gordievsky,[18] who had a long career in the KGB; KGB archivist Vasili Mitrokhin,[19] who defected to Britain in 1992 with a treasure trove of handwritten notes based on intelligence documents; and Pavel Sudoplatov,[20] who directed the secretive Administration for Special Tasks of the KGB during the Stalin era, which was responsible for sabotage, kidnapping, and assassination outside of the Soviet Union. All of these individuals described an extensive Soviet penetration of the United States during the World War II era.

In the early 1990s Klehr and Haynes examined Soviet files pertaining to the American Communist Party. From their study of these documents, the authors wrote *The Secret World of American Communism* and *The Soviet World of American Communism*. These works conclusively prove that the American Communist Party was tied in with the Soviet government and engaged in extensive espionage—a fact that was always patently obvious but which liberal apologists for Communism, who naturally loomed large in academia, denied. Klehr and Haynes write: "It is no longer possible to maintain that the Soviet Union did not fund the American party, that the CPUSA did not maintain a covert apparatus, and that key leaders and cadres were innocent of connection with Soviet espionage operations. Nowhere in the massive Comintern archives or in the American party's own records did the authors find documents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indicating that Soviet or CPUSA officials objected to American Communists cooperating with Soviet intelligence or even had second thoughts about the relationships. Both the Soviet Union and the American Communist leadership regarded these activities as normal and proper. Their only concern was that they not become public."[21] In short, the anti-Communist belief that "the American Communist movement assisted Soviet intelligence and placed loyalty to the Soviet Union ahead of loyalty to the United States was well-founded."[22]

The files of the KGB provided the basis for Allen Weinstein's *The Haunted Wood: Soviet Espionage in America – The Stalin Era*.[23] The "haunted wood" in the title is taken from a W. H. Auden poem "September 1, 1939," written upon his hearing of the German invasion of Poland. Weinstein had partial access to these archives during the years 1994 to 1996, since which time most Soviet archives have again been closed. Weinstein did not have direct personal access to the archives, but rather the material was copied and translated by a journalist who had once worked for the KGB, Alexander Vassiliev. The material was then submitted for review to the Russian Foreign Intelligence Service, which means that the most sensitive material may have been withheld. Nonetheless, the messages that were made available clearly brought out the existence of a high degree of Soviet espionage in the United States. The authors write that

> Soviet operatives and their American agents collected during the 1930s and 1940s a remarkable range of material on U.S. industrial and military production culminating in the data provided by its sources within the atomic research program during World War II. Moreover, during the New Deal and war years, the Soviets benefited from a voluminous amount of information coming from its key agents in a range of U.S. government agencies, including the Office of Strategic Services (OSS).[24]

Now for a brief discussion of some of the key Americans who served as Soviet agents and sources, as confirmed by the recently released documents. The name that perhaps stands out the most is that of Alger Hiss. His case in 1948 brought the issue of Communist subversion into the national spotlight. In part, what made the Hiss case such a national bombshell was the fact that he had all the proper establishment credentials. Hiss attended Johns Hopkins University and Harvard Law School, where he achieved academic and social prominence. At Harvard Law School, he became a protégé of Felix Frankfurter, who was one of Franklin Roosevelt's trusted advisors. Hiss entered government with Roosevelt's New Deal and moved into the State Department in 1936, where he rapidly advanced, eventually becoming the director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, a position that gave him access to secret documents from other departments and bureaus. Hiss engaged in the preparations for the Yalta Conference and served as an adviser to Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference in 1945. He also acted as the secretary general of the founding meeting of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Nations in San Francisco and helped to draft the UN Charter. Due to reports concerning his disloyalty, Hiss resigned from the State Department in December 1946 to become the president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He had been handpicked for that position by one of the pillars of the establishment, John Foster Dulles.[25]

In August 1948, Hiss's name burst into the national limelight when Whittaker Chambers testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that Hiss was working for the Soviet Union. To much of the media Chambers was initially the villain and Hiss an innocent victim. However, as a result of this investigation, Hiss was charged with perjury (the statute of limitations on espionage having expired). His first trial in 1949 ended in a hung jury, but in the following year a second jury found Hiss guilty and sentenced him to five years imprisonment. He was released from prison in 1954.

Many liberals did not accept the fact of Hiss's guilt; in fact, he became a cause célèbre for those who claimed that the whole Communists-in-government idea was illusory. Hiss himself professed his innocence until his death in 1996. However, the truth of Hiss's guilt was firmly bolstered by Allen Weinstein's *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case*, published in 1978.[26] Weinstein had begun his investigation in the belief that Hiss was innocent but found a mountain of evidence—including formerly classified FBI, OSS, CIA, State Department, and Justice Department documents, plus testimony from known spies—demonstrating otherwise. The Venona transcripts have provided additional confirmation, referring to a Soviet agent codenamed "Ales," whose description clearly matches that of Alger Hiss, a conclusion that the FBI drew in 1950.[27] And Soviet documents examined by Jerrold and Leona Schecter, coauthors of *Sacred Secrets: How Soviet Intelligence Operations Changed American History*, "reveal that he secretly met with a high ranking officer of the GRU . . . during the Yalta Conference and laid out for the Soviets all the strengths and weaknesses of the Western allies' bargaining position." This information greatly aided Stalin's arguments. "By giving away the American and British positions in advance of negotiations," they write, "Hiss abetted the lowering of the Iron Curtain."[28]

It might be added that Hiss came close to controlling the State Department—a little-known fact that doesn't seem to be noted in recent works. In the first part of 1946, Hiss proposed a radical reorganization of the Department of State. As William F. Buckley and L. Brent Bozell wrote in 1954: "Had his plan been approved, and had Hiss attained the personal power which, under the plan, he staked out for himself, the State Department would have taken a long step forward in the direction of becoming an adjunct to the Soviet Foreign Office."[29] Secretary of State Byrnes, however, rejected the proposed reorganization plan.

A dwindling number on the left still maintain Hiss's innocence. Since there would seem to be insurmountable converging evidence against Hiss, they have posited vast right-wing conspiracies involving the FBI, HUAC, Richard Nixon, the CIA, and other supposedly "right-wing" or "anti-Communist"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elements[30]—to which they now must add that one cannot believe KGB agents, KGB defectors, or KGB documents on the grounds that the KGB, and any one ever affiliated with the KGB, was inherently deceptive.[31] But these conspiratorial views would seem to be too farfetched to be entertained outside the Alice-in-Wonderland milieu of academia. And it must be noted that the establishment usually ridicules the notion of a conspiracy, no matter how small, when invoked by the anti-establishment right.

Perhaps the most influential Soviet agent to shape United States foreign and economic policy for the benefit of Moscow was Harry Dexter White.[32] Some apologists have questioned the possibility of his having been a Soviet agent because of his apparent support for capitalist economics, as illustrated by his instrumental role in the founding of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.[33] It is likely that White was neither a member of the Communist Party nor a formal part of Soviet intelligence, but Venona and other sources show that he was a "friendly source" who provided Soviet intelligence with direct access to high-level thinking in the Roosevelt administration throughout World War II.[34]

More than just providing the Soviets with information, White was what is known in intelligence circles as an "agent of influence," guiding American policy in the direction of Soviet interests. Holding a Harvard Ph.D. in economics, White was Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau's principal adviser, and ultimately served as assistant secretary of the Treasury. White brought to the Treasury a number of economists later identified as Communist agents, who helped him to make policy. And significantly, the Treasury Department would have a major role in shaping American foreign policy because of Morgenthau's close friendship with President Roosevelt.[35]

White was intimately involved in a number of key policies that served to benefit the Soviet Union. One of these was "Operation Snow," which involved American entrance into World War II. In 1941, Soviet policy sought to deflect the Japanese away from attacking the Soviet Union in support of Japan's German ally by exacerbating relations between the United States and Japan. Some members of the Roosevelt administration were considering in November 1941 a "modus vivendi" that would have provided a temporary truce with Japan until America had built up its military strength in the Far East. White, however, acted to undermine this proposal by writing a memo to Morgenthau that called for the Japanese evacuation of China, which was then incorporated into Secretary of State Cordell Hull's famous ultimatum to the Japanese on November 26, 1941. That message, many historians believe, was the final straw that goaded the Japanese into striking Pearl Harbor on December 7. Most historians, revisionist and establishment, do not believe that war with Japan could have been avoided. However, this should not be used to downplay White's effort. "What is certain," Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel note in their *Venona Secrets: Exposing Soviet Espionage and America's Traitors*, "is that Operation Snow was being carried out with Soviet, not American interests, in mind."[36]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

White's most notorious undertaking was his development of the Morgenthau Plan, which was adopted by the British and Americans at the Quebec conference in 1944. The stated objective of the Morgenthau Plan was to de-industrialize Germany and reduce its people to a pastoral existence. This would have involved the deportation of up to fifty million Germans to work in the foreign countries damaged by German aggression. Thus weakened, went the rationale, the allegedly inherently aggressive German nation would never rise again to threaten the peace of the world.[37] Morgenthau's support for the plan stemmed largely from his desire for revenge against the German people for the killing of his fellow Jews. Although White (originally Weiss) was also Jewish, he was working in the interests of the Soviet Union. Moscow hoped that so ruthless a policy would drive the German people into its hands, for it was promising a comparatively mild treatment to a "socialist" Germany. While the full success of the Soviet scheme did not materialize, word of the Morgenthau Plan, which was trumpeted by Nazi propaganda, did stiffen German military resistance to the Western allies and thus lengthened the war, allowing the Red Army to conquer more territory in Eastern and Central Europe as the fighting continued. Due to resistance in the U.S. government to the inhumanity and apparent harm to American interests that the plan would have caused, it was officially repudiated, but much of it served as the basis for the Army's order JCS 1067 that laid down the pattern of America's occupation policy until 1947, when developing Cold War strategic concerns began to outweigh the desire to punish Germans.[38]

White also acted to advance the interests of the Communist Chinese, who were at the time supported by the Soviet Union. Most significantly, White, along with two other Communist subversives in the Treasury Department, Frank Coe and Solomon Adler, acted to block delivery of a loan of $200 million in gold to enable the Chinese Nationalist government to prop up its faltering currency. Without the loan the Chinese suffered hyperinflation, which did immense damage to the Chinese economy and to the standing of the government vis-à-vis the Chinese Communists.[39]

Conservative Republicans, most prominently Joe McCarthy, would charge in the 1950s that Communist subversion in the U.S. government caused the "loss" of China. Establishment historians ridiculed the idea of a connection between U.S. policy and the Communist victory in China. So Haynes and Klehr diverge from the conventional view even when they acknowledge that "The obstruction of the gold loan made a minor, not a major, contribution to Mao's victory."[40] However, as historian Anthony Kubek has pointed out, American "China hands" oriented a host of measures to harm the Nationalist Chinese, not simply the gold loan issue.[41] While one cannot know alternate history, once it has been established that such U.S. government officials as White served as Communist agents, the idea that China was "lost" due to U.S. policymakers does not seem so far-fetched.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As a result of ill health, White resigned as U.S. executive director of the IMF in 1947. The next year Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers identified White as part of a Soviet spy network in testimony to the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC). White appeared before HUAC to deny all charges. Shortly thereafter he died of a heart attack, and thus never had to face criminal charges.

Although Soviet penetration primarily impacted the executive branch, the Soviets had at least one operative in Congress in the 1930s: Representative Samuel Dickstein of New York. Dickstein never provided any crucial information to the Soviets, and he expected to be well paid for what he did provide, which earned him the code name "Crook" from his Soviet handlers. The most interesting thing about Dickstein is that he was a leading Congressional figure in the creation of what eventually became the House Un-American Activities Committee. Dickstein, however, sought to use such a committee to investigate right-wing groups.[42]

Intriguing, yet understandable, is the fact that some of those Americans who went the furthest in ridiculing the idea of Soviet spies in the government had been personally involved with Soviet intelligence. For example, Venona shows that leftist journalist I. F. Stone, who was highly regarded by establishment liberals for his alleged honesty, had contacts with Soviet intelligence agents and received money from the Soviet Union.[43]

One can imagine that Stone's Soviet paymasters must have enjoyed his public arguments that the whole idea of Soviet penetration in American society was simply a partisan lie fabricated by the political Right. Another journalist who later confessed to working for Soviet intelligence was Michael Straight, editor of the liberal journal, *The New Republic*. Although Straight had completely broken with the Soviet intelligence in 1942, his public downplaying of Soviet espionage was certainly disingenuous.[44]

Probably the most valuable information provided to the Soviet Union came from the spies involved with the atomic bomb project. The atomic spies included British citizen Klaus Fuchs and Americans Harry Gold, David Greenglass, Morton Sobell, David and Ethel Rosenberg, and Theodore Hall. Theodore Hall's name only came to public attention with the release of the Venona transcripts. Hall, who had been a teenage physics prodigy working on the Manhattan Project, provided key information to the Soviets, enabling them to construct their first nuclear weapon. The FBI interrogated Hall but he never confessed. Hall was never publicly accused by the government since it did not want to publicly reveal Venona by using its decrypts as evidence in court and it lacked other evidence of his spy activity.[45]

Regarding the long-standing controversy concerning the Rosenbergs, the key to the government's case against them was the confession of David Greenglass, who worked on the A-bomb project at Los Alamos and was Ethel Rosenberg's brother. The Venona transcripts now confirm that Julius was an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

atomic spy for the Soviet Union.[46] Whether the couple should have been executed, or whether Ethel, whose complicity was less, should have been executed, is another matter, especially since the Soviets derived more significant information on the atomic bomb from other sources. It is likely that the government tried to use the death sentences as leverage to obtain confessions from the Rosenbergs and thus catch other members of the spy ring, but the Rosenbergs, as good Communists, would not confess.[47]

Although the Soviet scientists on their own would have eventually developed an atomic bomb, the espionage certainly gave them great advantages. John E. Haynes writes: "Espionage, however, saved the Soviet Union several years and an immense amount of money because it was able to skip much of the expensive development stage of the bomb project. The additional expense and added years and uncertainty of building an atomic bomb without espionage would have been a major burden to the Soviet Union and restrained Stalin's foreign policy objectives. It is unlikely, for example, that he would have approved North Korea's invasion of South Korea in 1950 had the American atomic monopoly still existed."[48]

A major new revelation regarding the atomic spying is that J. Robert Oppenheimer, the scientific director of the Manhattan Project, consciously cooperated with Soviet intelligence. There had always been suspicions about Oppenheimer. It was well known that Oppenheimer had Communist sympathies, close relations who were Communists—his wife, mistress, brother, and sister-in-law were all Party members—and associations with people involved in Soviet espionage. Oppenheimer had been questioned about his Communist connections, but while admitting a youthful flirtation with Communist ideology always denied any connection to Soviet Communist intelligence. Finally, in 1954, Oppenheimer lost his security clearance, preventing him from continuing to serve as chairman of the General Advisory Committee on Atomic Energy. As a result of this punishment, the establishment media portrayed Oppenheimer as a martyr of the McCarthy "witch hunt."

In 1994, the Oppenheimer loyalty issue was reignited with the publication of a memoir by the ex-KGB general Pavel Sudoplatov, with the assistance of two Americans, Jerrold and Leona Schecter, which claimed that Oppenheimer had knowingly assisted Soviet intelligence, though it did not specifically label him a Soviet spy.[49] This revelation triggered a virtual firestorm among Oppenheimer's supporters, who included an influential segment of the American scientific community. They managed to gain the support of the chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, Les Aspin, who announced at a press conference that FBI files disproved Sudoplatov's charges.[50]

Jerrold and Leona Schecter, in *Sacred Secrets: How Soviet Intelligence Operations Changed American History*, provide information that Oppenheimer himself was a Communist Party member well into 1942, when he was told by

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the KGB to drop his membership so as to stay hidden from American authorities. Soviet documents prove that Oppenheimer met with the KGB's resident in San Francisco, Gregory Kheifitz, whom he provided secret information. At the behest of Soviet agents, Oppenheimer also agreed to hire Communist spies to work on the Manhattan Project, including Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist.[51]

To illustrate their findings, the Schecters reproduce in their appendix an actual document from the Soviet Intelligence Archives, dated Oct. 2, 1944, received and signed by KGB head Lavrenti Beria, referring to Oppenheimer as a "member of the 'apparat' of Comrade Browder," who, at the request of Kheifitz, "provided cooperation in access to research for several of our tested sources including a relative of Comrade Browder."[52]

Like many of the pro-Soviet subversives, Oppenheimer was Jewish, and it appears that loyalty to his ethnic group helped motivate his support for Soviet Communism. The Schecters write: "Kheifetz made sure that Oppenheimer received the news...that Stalin was about to set up a Jewish autonomous republic in the Crimea. Kheifetz later reported that Oppenheimer, the son of German-Jewish immigrants, was deeply moved to know that Stalin had guaranteed a secure place for Jews in the Soviet Union when the war against Germany was won."[53] In actuality, Stalin launched anti-Semitic measures after World War II, culminating in his fabricated "Jewish Doctors' Plot." Instead of sending Soviet Jewry to the balmy Crimea, it seems that Stalin planned to deport them to the frigid Siberian wastes of the Jewish Autonomous Republic of Birobidzhan.[54]

The most prominent new individual now identified as a Soviet agent is Harry Hopkins, President Roosevelt's close wartime adviser, who actually lived in the White House. Hopkins met with Stalin as Roosevelt's representative and accompanied Roosevelt to his meetings with the Soviet dictator. Hopkins's advice to Roosevelt invariably advanced the Soviet position. For example, he fought against providing aid to the anti-Communist Polish underground in its 1944 uprising against the Germans, thus allowing them to be slaughtered, which facilitated the Soviet Communist takeover of Poland. Hopkins consistently pushed for the establishment of East European governments friendly to the Soviet Union, which essentially meant controlled by Communists. Hopkins even went so far as to insist on shipping uranium to Moscow as part of Lend- Lease.[55]

In a book that appeared in 1990, KGB defector Oleg Gordievsky revealed that he had attended a lecture by Iskhak Akhmerov, who had been in charge of illegal undercover agents in the United States during World War II, in which Akhmerov designated Harry Hopkins as the most important Soviet wartime agent in the United States. Akhmerov went on to make reference to his many personal contacts with Hopkins. Gordievsky later discussed the Hopkins case with other KGB experts on America who affirmed what Akhmerov had said.[56]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After discussions with his coauthor, Christopher Andrew, Gordievsky would only say that Hopkins was an "unconscious agent," who sincerely believed in the beneficence of Stalin's Russia.[57] It should be added that Akhmerov's meetings with Hopkins have been confirmed by the Venona transcripts.[58]

A similar evaluation of Hopkins was provided by KGB defector Vasili Mitrohkyn in his *The Sword and the Shield*, coauthored by Christopher Andrew. According to this work, Hopkins actually warned the Soviet embassy that the FBI had bugged a secret meeting in which a Soviet operative had passed money to Steve Nelson, who was a leading member of the U.S. Communist underground. Coauthor Andrew once again rejected the idea that Hopkins was a Soviet agent, writing that "KGB officers boasted that he had been a Soviet agent. These boasts were far from the truth. Hopkins was an American patriot with little sympathy for the Soviet system." According to Andrew, Hopkins simply sought to aid the Soviets, including passing confidential information on to them, in order to help the United States, because, in Hopkins's mind, what aided the Soviet Union also helped the United States.[59] It is not apparent to this writer why any of this would exclude Hopkins from being referred to as a Soviet agent.

Romerstein and Breindel reject as "unrealistic" the notion of Hopkins being simply an "unconscious" agent. Some commentators have maintained that Hopkins only dealt secretly with Soviet officials with Roosevelt's permission—that he was Roosevelt's "back channel" to Stalin. Romerstein and Breindel argue that while this description might be appropriate if Hopkins had dealt only with Soviet diplomats, it would not apply to Hopkins since he met with "illegal" operatives such as Akhmerov, who was working under cover as a businessman, not as a member of the Soviet government. Romerstein and Breindel point out that Akhmerov would not have broken his cover and revealed himself as a Soviet intelligence officer unless Hopkins had been part of the Soviet spy apparatus.[60]

The historians who now reveal the extent of Communist subversion of the United States still shy away from any type of reassessment of the individual who personified the era—Senator Joseph McCarthy. They hold that after a torpid start, which they acknowledge involved cover-ups for politically partisan reasons, the Truman administration removed Communist subversives from the government before McCarthy began his anti-Communist activities in 1950. As Harvey Klehr writes: "This new evidence is forcing the revision of many of the prevailing myths about the internal communist threat to American democracy in the postwar era. None of it exculpates McCarthy. He remains a political bully who hurt a number of people."[61] The only work to defend McCarthy after the new revelations is Arthur Herman's *Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator*.[62] In a critical review of this book, Sam Tanenhaus (who has written a favorable biography of Whittaker Chambers) sticks to the conventional liberal line that McCarthy

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed "to locate any fresh Red scalps for the simple reason that almost none were to be found."[63] Herman, in contrast, points out that the charge of McCarthy's foes that "he never exposed a single spy or Communist" is a "claim that is manifestly untrue."[64] With some new material, Herman essentially affirms the sound defense of McCarthy made by William F. Buckley and L. Brent Bozell in their 1954 classic, *McCarthy and His Enemies: The Record and Its Meaning*.

Truman's alleged elimination of pro-Communists from government was certainly not apparent in the State Department. Actually, the security problem at the State Department had worsened considerably in 1945, when employees of terminated wartime agencies were transferred to State. Some of these agencies, such as the Office of Strategic Services and the Office of War Information, were riddled with Communists. The State Department official who supervised the merger, J. Anthony Panuch, told a Congressional committee that it had caused extensive Communist infiltration of the State Department. But neither Panuch nor his principal assistants were able to implement their long-range plan to remove security risks. In 1947, the new Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, at the behest of Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson, removed Panuch and every key member of his security staff. And from June 1947 until McCarthy's famous February 9, 1950 speech in which he claimed the State Department had harbored a large number of pro-Communist subversives, the State Department did not fire one person as a loyalty or security risk.[65]

The standard anti-McCarthy mantra that Truman had successfully dealt with the Communists-in-government problem and that McCarthy never found any Communists is at the very best a half-truth. While it is true that in his public statements McCarthy sometimes went beyond the evidence by stating that there were actual Communist Party members in the State Department—a wording that he apparently used in his February 9, 1950, speech in Wheeling, West Virginia—the real issue before the public was whether there were security and loyalty risks employed in the government who might clandestinely aid the interests of America's Communist enemy, regardless of whether or not they were members of the Communist Party. And McCarthy was more careful in his terminology in his later speech on the subject before the U. S. Senate on February 20. As a result of McCarthy's charges, the Senate on February 22, 1950, authorized the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to conduct an investigation to determine "whether persons who are disloyal to the United States are, or have been, employed by the Department of State." Note that there was no need for McCarthy to prove actual Communist Party membership.[66]

While the majority report of the subcommittee headed by Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland unambiguously cleared all of the individuals cited by McCarthy and branded his charges as "a fraud and a hoax" perpetrated on the American people,[67] it is hard to concur that every one of the vindicated

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individuals was innocent. And even the finding of one individual loyalty risk would overturn the conventional view that McCarthy's charges were totally baseless.

Among the leading loyalty risks named by McCarthy was Owen Lattimore, whom McCarthy labeled "the top Russian spy." This was undoubtedly an exaggeration, since there was considerable competition for this position, but Lattimore was undoubtedly an individual of at best questionable loyalty. Even Thomas Reeves, a liberal McCarthy biographer, admitted that "Lattimore himself was no doubt a fellow traveler" and the Institute of Pacific Relations, in which Lattimore was a leading figure, was "infiltrated by Communists and fellow travelers."[68]

The public record demonstrated that Lattimore's positions followed the Soviet line and that he would deliberately present lies to advance the Soviet Communist position. For example, Lattimore defended Stalin's show trials and referred to the Soviet Union as a democracy. During the Nazi-Soviet Pact he supported neutrality, claiming that there was little to choose between Great Britain and Nazi Germany. Institute of Pacific Relations files showed that, in a 1938 letter to IPR's executive director, he advocated backing the Soviet Union's "international policy in general but without using their slogans and above all without giving them or anybody else an impression of subservience." In 1949, he said he wanted "to let South Korea fall—but not to let it look as though we pushed it."[69] To historian John E. Haynes, however, "None of this proved that Lattimore was a spy or even that he was a concealed Communist."[70]

Unlike establishment thinkers such as Haynes, McCarthy abided by the old adage: "If it walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, and acts like duck, then it must be a duck." Although perhaps Lattimore only acted like a Soviet agent of influence, considering him part of the Soviet espionage apparatus would not be unreasonable. Besides, ex-Communist Louis Budenz had testified at the Tydings Committee hearings that Lattimore was a Communist. In 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, headed by Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, probed much more deeply into Lattimore's background in its Institute of Pacific Relations hearings and unanimously concluded that Lattimore was a "conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy." At the Institute of Pacific Relations hearings, defector Alexander Barmine, who had been an operative of Soviet intelligence, testified that Lattimore was a member of Soviet military intelligence.[71]

While the liberal establishment cavalierly throws out such terms of opprobrium as "racist," "fascist," and "anti-Semite," as potentially destructive of individual careers as they are arbitrary in meaning, in contrast, the utmost linguistic precision was demanded of Senator McCarthy. In terms of American security, however, it hardly mattered whether an individual pursued Soviet interests as a result of formal orders from Soviet intelligence or the Communist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Party, or from the voluntary belief that aid to the Soviet Union would serve to foster world peace or some other beneficial goal. As Haynes acknowledges, "Lattimore's views about communism and the Soviet Union were such that most Americans would not want him anywhere near the making of American foreign policy."[72] This was all that McCarthy needed to prove. In his assessment of the Lattimore record, Herman goes even further, concluding that Lattimore was "something closer to the McCarran Committee's evaluation that he was a 'conscious and articulate' instrument of Stalinism."[73]

Another significant instance that McCarthy presented to the Tydings Committee was that of John Stewart Service, a career diplomat stationed in China during World War II. Service's prolific diplomatic dispatches had consistently portrayed the Nationalist government as totalitarian, inefficient, and corrupt, while depicting the Chinese Communists as democratic, progressive, and honest. In fact, he denied that the Chinese Communists were really Communists, referring to them as "so-called Communists." Upon returning to the United States, Service was caught transmitting classified documents to the editor of the aforementioned pro-Communist journal, *Amerasia*.[74]

The *Amerasia* case was a complex affair, which the Tydings Committee investigated. The story of the case is as follows: After noticing the appearance of confidential material in the *Amerasia* journal, investigators from the Office of Strategic Services broke into its offices in March 1945 and discovered thousands of highly classified government documents, some labeled "top secret." Keeping the break-in secret, the FBI undertook physical surveillance of those thought to be involved in the theft of the documents. On June 6, 1945, the FBI arrested six people—including Service and the journal's editor, Philip Jaffe—who were charged with having engaged in espionage. The Justice Department never made much of an effort to prosecute the case, holding that the pilfered documents were unimportant. Ultimately only two of the individuals arrested (excluding Service) were convicted for the offense of conspiring to steal government documents, and were assessed minor fines. By November 1945 the *Amerasia* case was officially closed.[75]

Conservative anti-Communists were enraged by the government's soft attitude to what they regarded as a serious case of espionage, and charged a government cover-up. That the documents were innocuous was not apparent to Undersecretary of State Joseph Grew when he ordered the arrests. As historian Anthony Kubek (one of the few early historians who recognized the reality of extensive Soviet espionage in the U.S. government) wrote in a 1970 assessment: "Many of the pilfered documents were of vital diplomatic and military importance in wartime, just as the original classifications indicated."[76] With new documentary information available, Harvey Klehr and Ronald Radosh, in their *Amerasia Spy Case: Prelude to McCarthyism*, show that those in the highest ranks of the Truman administration, including Communist

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

White House aide Lauchlin Currie and Attorney General Tom Clark, successfully covered up the affair. The authors provide evidence of Jaffe's longstanding Soviet sympathies and show that he was in contact with Soviet intelligence officials and did make use of Service as an espionage source. They do, however, maintain that Service was unaware of Jaffe's Soviet connections and intentions, and simply believed he was involved in a leaking operation that would undermine his pro-Chiang superiors and the Nationalist Chinese government.[77]

Although the evidence might not show Service to be a conscious foreign agent, nonetheless it does reveal him to have been an individual who engaged in illegal activities to advance the interests of Communism. In December 1951, after the conclusion of the Tydings hearings, the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board concluded that there was "reasonable doubt" as to Service's loyalty and ordered his dismissal from the State Department. Service fought in the federal courts for reinstatement, and the Supreme Court in 1957 ruled in his favor on a technicality: that Service's discharge violated State Department regulations that required an adverse ruling from the State Department's own Loyalty-Security Board.[78] It should be added, however, that the State Department had a security standard that was less lenient toward an employee than the Civil Service loyalty program. It simply called for the dismissal of an employee in the "interest of national security." And there needed to be only a "reasonable doubt" of the employee's reliability. It would seem reasonable that an employee who leaked classified documents to an individual with a Communist background should, under the existing standard, be dismissed.[79]

Even if Lattimore and Service were not actual Communists, McCarthy did in fact name other Communists. One of these individuals was Mary Jane Keeney, who worked in a number of various sensitive overseas State Department jobs during the 1940s before moving on to the United Nations. After McCarthy's disclosures at the Tydings hearings, the State Department had her removed from her post at the United Nations.[80]

McCarthy also identified Gustavo Duran as a Communist. Testimony regarding Duran's Stalinism, including his work for the Spanish Communist secret police during the Spanish Civil War—even a picture of him in a Communist uniform—was dismissed by liberals as Francoist propaganda. Herman, however, points out that Duran was "not only a Communist but a central figure in Stalin's cold-blooded purge of his Trotskyite and anarchist allies during the Spanish Civil War."[81]

Although recent books on Communist subversion still bemoan the "McCarthyite purges" of government employees as civil liberties violations, their presentation of the reality of Communist subversion would seem to belie this criticism. What largely accounted for the success of Soviet espionage in the United States during the Roosevelt years was the government's tolerance of employees with pro-Communist or even outright Communist backgrounds: It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was from such persons that the Soviet Union had been able to recruit most of its agents and sources. Such actual or potential supporters of Soviet Communism in the federal government were either weeded out or had to lie low during the McCarthyist anti-Communist backlash of the early 1950s. As Allen Weinstein writes: the Soviet Union could no longer rely on "recruiting dedicated Communists or other radical supporters of the Soviet Union, whose numbers had been reduced dramatically and whose future remained perilous in a time of anti-Communist purges."[82] After the 1940s Soviet Communist subversion was forced to rely largely on paid spies, and never again approached the successes achieved during the Roosevelt era. Since the recent works point out that Soviet Communist subversion affected American security, there would seem to be backhanded acknowledgement that these "anti-Communist purges," which affected Communists and pro-Communists (including some individuals who were probably not actual or potential subversives), performed a major benefit for the security of the United States. In short, McCarthyist anti-Communism served to dry up the swamp that spawned Soviet Communist agents.

But what about McCarthy's infringement of such civil liberties as freedom of speech and freedom of association? Was American security worth this price? As a result of McCarthy, a few people lost their government jobs, but no one was sentenced to jail for their beliefs. Far greater restrictions on civil liberties were imposed in other eras of American history, often when establishment icons were at the helm. During the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus throughout the country and had individuals incarcerated simply for criticizing the war effort. During World War I, Woodrow Wilson's administration imprisoned a number of people for opposing the war, the most important of whom was Eugene V. Debs. And Franklin Roosevelt's most notorious infringement of civil liberties was the forced relocation of Japanese-Americans.

While liberals posed as champions of absolute freedom of opinion during "the McCarthy era," this has not been the liberals' position in other eras. It should be noted that from the 1930s through the World War II period, there was a strong "anti-fascist" campaign, largely directed by liberals and leftists and subscribed to by the Roosevelt administration. Numerous books and movies portrayed a huge (but non-existent) fifth-column of hate-ridden Nazis that was about to take over America. Federal, state, and local governments enacted various measures to punish right-wing elements and pro-Nazis. For example, in 1940 Congress enacted a law forbidding the employment of Bundists by the federal government, and denied unemployed Bundists relief work from the Works Progress Administration. Roosevelt administration officials smeared anti-interventionists, including members of the America First Committee, as Nazis.[83]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Historian John E. Haynes sees similarities between the anti-fascist hysteria and the actions of postwar anti-communism.[84] Obviously, one major difference is that while the alleged postwar anti-Communist hysteria has been a never-ending focus of establishment concern, the earlier anti-fascist hysteria has been almost totally blotted from historical memory. An even greater dissimilarity between the two movements is that while there was substance to the beliefs of Communist subversion, the fascist fifth-column was totally imaginary, and individuals were persecuted solely for their opinions—as unsavory as some of them may have been. Even Haynes must conclude: "For all its sporadic ugliness, excesses and silliness, the anticommunism of the 1940s and 1950s was an understandable and rational response to a real danger to American democracy."[85]

As is apparent today, the concern for freedom of opinion no longer reigns as supreme in the establishment liberal pantheon of virtues as it (purportedly) did during the McCarthy years. It is liberals who have been at the forefront of restricting so-called "hate speech," which has been made a crime in much of the "democratic" Western world. (Given the liberals' soft spot for totalitarian Communism, it is hard to believe that they ever truly regarded freedom of opinion as the highest social goal.)

Returning to the civil liberties violations of the McCarthy era, it should be added that often even erroneous charges by anti-Communists do not merit the harsh condemnation conventionally meted out by the establishment. The errors were quite understandable. Since liberal policies were so similar to those of Soviet Communism, it was hard to determine whether a person was following a pro-Soviet policy because he was a Soviet agent or merely out of sincere, liberal beliefs. Instead of showing a grave flaw in anti-Communism, however, this would seem to show something seriously amiss with liberalism. In short, liberalism propounded views beneficial to Soviet Communism that were completely contrary to reality and harmful to the interests of the United States. Objectively speaking, it did not really matter whether an individual was aiding the Soviet Union because he was a Communist or from a liberal vision of world peace, support for the underdog, destruction of evil, etc. To combat Communism successfully, it was essential to remove liberals from critical posts in the government. As James Burnham pointed out "What communism does is to carry the liberal principles to their logical and practical extreme....The liberal's arm cannot strike with consistent firmness against communism, either domestically or internationally, because the liberal dimly feels that in doing so he would be somehow wounding himself."[86] That Soviet Communism eventually fell came about largely despite the efforts of American liberalism.

One final issue concerns what constitutes historical proof. Why was it necessary to have new evidence from Venona and the Soviet archives to prove extensive Soviet subversion? Why wasn't this believed before? Why was the extensive, converging evidence of ex-Communist agents, Soviet defectors, FBI

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reports, and even public documents insufficient? This very stringent standard of proof for Soviet subversion might be contrasted with the rather lenient standard applied to some Nazi German atrocities, which rely heavily on eyewitness accounts in the absence —for whatever reason—of documents and physical evidence. This says something about the establishment's version of truth. Evidence that would constitute proof on one topic is dismissed when applied to another. In short, the establishment has drastically different standards of proof. But probably the readers of this journal already understand the meaning of the establishment's version of truth.

Stephen J. Sniegoski holds a Ph.D. in American diplomatic history and is the author of several historical articles.

ENDNOTES

1. Carroll Quigley, *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the World in Our Time* (New York: MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 919.

2. This paper will consistently use the term KGB, by which the top Soviet security agency was best known, although this agency had different names throughout its history. During much of WWII, it was officially named the NKGB, while earlier it was the NKVD.

3. Herbert Romerstein and Eric Breindel, *The Venona Secrets: Exposing Soviet Espionage and America's Traitors* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, 2000), pp. 124–25.

4. National Security Agency, Central Intelligence Agency, "Venona: Soviet Espionage and the American Response, 1939–1957," Preface, 1996. http://www.cia.gov/csi/books/venona/preface.htm.

5. Bradley F. Smith, *The Shadow Warriors: O.S.S. and the Origins of the C.I.A.* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), pp. 345–46.

6. The idea that Stalin pushed for war has been bandied about for some time. See, for example, Ernst Topitsch, *Stalin's War: A Radical New Theory of the Origins of the Second World War* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987). In recent years this view has been given greater credence by the work of Viktor Suvorov (Vladimir Rezun), *Icebreaker: Who Started the Second World War?* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1990). Suvorov brings up the more controversial argument that Stalin had intended to attack Hitler in 1941, and that the German attack was preemptive. For a review of this issue, see: R. C. Raack, "Stalin's Role in the Coming of World War II," *World Affairs*, 158:4 (Spring 1996) http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/raack.htm and "Stalin's Role in the Coming of World War II: The International Debate Goes On," *World Affairs*, 159:2 (Fall 1996). http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/raack2.htm.

7. Benjamin Colby, *'Twas a Famous Victory: Deception and Propaganda in the War with Germany* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House Publishers, 1974). An example of some of the effective pro-Soviet propaganda from the private sector includes Joseph E. Davies's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

best-selling *Mission to Moscow*, which became a movie, and Quentin Reynolds, *Only the Stars Are Neutral*. Both of these works went so far as to defend Stalin's purges as a positive good. For a discussion of the pro-Soviet propaganda fest see Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, *Leftism: From de Sade and Marx to Hitler and Marcuse* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House Publishers, 1974), pp. 299–302.

8. Harvey Klehr and Ronald Radosh, *The Amerasia Spy Case: Prelude to McCarthyism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

9. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 52–53; Jerrold and Leona Schecter, Sacred Secrets: How Soviet Intelligence Operations Changed American History (Washington: Brassey's, 2002), pp. 118.

10. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, p. 454.

11. Harry S. Truman, *Memoirs,* vol. II, *Years of Trial and Hope* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1956), p. 291.

12. A number of individuals writing on American counterintelligence vaguely alluded to the secret project. For example: Robert J. Lamphere and Tom Shactman, *The FBI-KGB War: A Special Agent's Story* (New York: Random House, 1986) and David Martin, *Wilderness of Mirrors* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1981).

13. John Earl Haynes and Harvey Klehr, *Venona: Decoding Soviet Espionage in America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1999).

14. Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, and Fridrikh Igorevich Firsov, *The Secret World of American Communism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995) and Harvey Klehr, John Earl Haynes, and K. M. Anderson, *The Soviet World of American Communism* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

15. Haynes and Klehr, *Venona*, p. 7.

16. Ibid., p. 19.

17. Ibid., p. 332.

18. Christopher Andrew and Oleg Gordievsky, *KGB: The Inside Story* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990).

19. Christopher Andrew and Vasili Mitrokhin, *The Sword and the Shield: The Mitrokhin Archive and the Secret History of the KGB* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).

20. Pavel and Anatoli Sudoplatov with Jerrold L. and Leona P. Schecter, *Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness: A Soviet Spymaster* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1995).

21. Klehr, Haynes, and Firsov, *Secret World of American Communism*, pp. 18–19.

22. Ibid., p. 326.

23. Allen Weinstein and Alexander Vassiliev, The Haunted Wood: Soviet Espionage in America: The Stalin Era (New York: Random House, 1999).

24. Weinstein and Vassiliev, *Haunted Wood*, p. xix.

25. Allen Weinstein, *Perjury: The Hiss-Chambers Case* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978).

26. Ibid., *Perjury*.

27. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona*, pp. 136–37.

28. Jerrold and Leona Schecter, *Sacred Secrets*, pp. 128–31.

29. William F. Buckley, Jr. and L. Brent Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies* (Chicago: Regnery, 1954), p. 10.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

30. Allen Weinstein analyzes these various and conflicting pro-Hiss conspiracy theories in *Perjury*, pp. 569–89. There have also been claims that Hiss was framed by elements of the Left—Trotskyites, the American Communist Party, the KGB, the Soviet super-secret agency SMERSH—but these have not taken hold among Hiss partisans.

31. Hiss's main supporter, John Lowenthal, contacted Russian Colonel General Dmitry Volkogonov, who had been overseeing the Russian archives, to check material on Hiss. Volkogonov initially said that he could find no material in the KGB files. Lowenthal interpreted this to mean that Hiss was innocent. However, Hiss was an agent not of the KGB but of military intelligence (GRU), the files of which were closed even to Volkogonov. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, p. 139–41.

32. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets* , pp. 29–30.

33. The connection between international communism and international finance would not seem so incongruous to persons of a non-establishment rightwing persuasion. Anti-establishment historian Antony C. Sutton has made a connection between international finance and communism. See for example, Anthony C. Sutton, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1974). http://reformed-theology.org/html/books/bolshevik_revolution/

34. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, p. 45; Jerrold and Leona Schecter, *Sacred Secrets*, p. 124.

35. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 29–30.

36. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 42–43, The Schecters maintain that White was manipulated by Soviet intelligence to introduce the Soviet goals into his initiatives regarding the Far East without his being aware of the consequences of the demand that the Japanese pull out of China. Jerrold and Leona Schecter, *Sacred Secrets*, pp. 21–41. Romerstein/Breindel and the Schecters rely heavily on a recent Russian work on this subject: Vitaliy Pavlov, *Operatziya "Sneg"* (Moscow: Gaia Herum, 1996).

37. Jerrold and Leona Schecter, *Sacred Secrets* , p. 124.

38. Freda Utley, *The High Cost of Vengeance* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1949), p. 15. http://www.fredautley.com/

39. Haynes and Klehr, *Venona*, pp. 142–45.

40. Ibid., p. 145.

41. Anthony Kubek, *How the Far East Was Lost: American Policy and the Creation of Communist China, 1941–1949* (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1963).

42. Weinstein and Vassiliev, *Haunted Wood*, pp. 140–50.

43. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 433–39.

44. Ibid., p. 109; Weinstein and Vassiliev, *Haunted Wood*, pp. 72–83.

45. Venona Intercepts, "The November 12, 1944 cable: Theodore Alvin Hall and Saville Sax," http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/venona/inte_19441112.html; Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 202–205; Haynes and Klehr, *Venona*, pp. 314–17; Joseph Albright and Marcia Kunstel, *Bombshell: The Secret Story of America's Unknown Atomic Spy Conspiracy*, (New York: Times Books, 1997).

46. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 234–35.

47. Ronald Radosh and Joyce Milton, *The Rosenberg File: A Search for Truth* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1983. 2d ed. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997) argue that while the Rosenbergs were guilty of spying their trial was conducted in an unsavory manner.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

48. John Earl Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace? American Communism and Anticommunism in the Cold War Era* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1996), p. 63.

49. Pavel and Antoli Sudoplatov with Jerrold L. and Leona P. Schecter, *Special Tasks: The Memoirs of an Unwanted Witness – A Soviet Spymaster* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1995), pp. 181–97.

50. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 275–76.

51. Jerrold and Leona Schecter, *Sacred Secrets*, pp. 49–52.

52. Ibid., pp. 315–17.

53. Ibid., p. 49.

54. Yaakov Eisenstadt, "Stalin's Planned Genocide," *Dei'ah veDibur*, March 6, 2002, http://www.shemayisrael.com/chareidi/archives5762/vaypek/VP62features2.htm

55. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, p. 211.

56. Christopher Andrew and Oleg Gordievsky, *KGB: The Inside Story of Its Foreign Operations from Lenin to Gorbachev* (New York: Harper Collins, 1990), p. 287.

57. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, p. 213.

58. Ibid., p. 213.

59. Andrew and Mitrokhin, *Sword and the Shield*, p. 111.

60. Romerstein and Breindel, *Venona Secrets*, pp. 213–15.

61. Harvey Klehr, "Red Scare Revisited," CNN Interactive, http://asia.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/episodes/06/then.now/.

62. Arthur Herman, *Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator* (New York: The Free Press, 2000).

63. Sam Tanenhaus, "Un-American Activities," Review of *Joseph McCarthy: Reexamining the Life and Legacy of America's Most Hated Senator*, *New York Review of Books*, November 30, 2000, *http://www.nybooks.com/articles/13910*. Tanenhaus is the author of *Whittaker Chambers: A Biography* (New York: Random House, 1997).

64. Herman, *Joseph McCarthy*, p. 4.

65. William J. Gill, *The Ordeal of Otto Otepka* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House Publishers, 1969), p. 38; Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, pp. 9–30.

66. Buckley and Bozell, pp. 65–67.

67. Ibid., p. 63.

68. Thomas C. Reeves, *The Life and Times of Joe McCarthy: A Biography* (New York: Stein and Day, 1982), p. 255.

69. Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace?*, p. 151.

70. Ibid., p. 151.

71. U.S. Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Internal Security Subcommittee, *Institute of Pacific Relations, Hearings*, 82nd Congress, 1st Session, *Final Report* (Washington: US Government Printing Office, 1951), p. 224.

72. Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace?*, p. 151.

73. Herman, *Joseph McCarthy*, p. 127–28.

74. Anthony Kubek, "Introduction," *The Amerasia Papers: A Clue to the Catastrophe of China*, vol. I, prepared by the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., 1st sess. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 30–34.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

75. Ibid., pp. 1–113.
76. Ibid., p. 78.
77. Radosh and Klehr, *Amerasia Spy Case*, pp. 210–18.
78. Kubek, *Amerasia Papers*, pp. 65–67.
79. Buckley and Bozell, *McCarthy and His Enemies*, pp. 18–30.
80. Herman, *Joseph McCarthy*, pp. 109-110.
81. Ibid., p. 109.
82. Weinstein and Vassiliev, *Haunted Wood*, pp. 299.
83. Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace?*, pp. 22–36.
84. Haynes writes: "Virtually every one of the tactics used in the 1930s and early 1940s to harass fascist and suspected far rightists would after World War II be used against Communists and those suspected of left-wing sympathies."
85. Haynes, *Red Scare or Red Menace?*, p. 27.
86. James Burnham, *Suicide of the West: An Essay on the Meaning and Destiny of Liberalism* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1964), pp. 289–90.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ever Heard of Herbert Marcuse? How About Theodore Adorno?

(You are not alone ...)

Their names may not be well-known today, but these men led a small group of Marxists who formed the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt, Germany shortly after World War I. Although still obscure to this day, the Frankfurt School has profoundly changed the culture and politics of America for generations. Every radical Leftist movement, from feminism to gay rights, was spawned by the Frankfurt School. (In support of his Red comrades in Vietnam, Marcuse himself coined the phrase "Make Love Not War.")

To expose the origins of left wing totalitarianism in America, the CONSERVATIVE CITIZENS' FOUNDATION is now offering a new documentary video: *Political Correctness – The Frankfurt School Story.* See for yourself how the work of Marxist theorists sabotaged American culture and beliefs through "Critical Theory" and other destructive doctrines. *Political Correctness did not happen by accident.*

Don't be fooled any longer!
Order *The Frankfurt School Story*
video tape today by sending just $7.00 to:

CONSERVATIVE CITIZENS FOUNDATION
P.O. BOX 221683 ST. LOUIS, MO 63122

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEXIFORNIA:

SENSE, SOFTHEADEDNESS, AND SUBVERSION

Mexifornia: A State of Becoming
Victor Davis Hanson
San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2003
$24.95

150 pp.

Reviewed by John Attarian

Immigration is profoundly transforming America, especially California, which receives millions of Mexican immigrants. In *Mexifornia*, Victor Davis Hanson, a classicist at California State University, Fresno, and a Central Valley farmer, takes a hard look at immigration into the state and its meaning. Drawing on his teaching and farming experience, Hanson challenges immigrationist dogmas, but his performance is mixed. An important addition to the immigration debate, *Mexifornia* merits sustained scrutiny.

California, he observes, is a bellwether, so how immigration plays out there prefigures America's fate. Our predicament is "apparently unsolvable": Americans want foreigners for unpleasant work, but wrongly assume they will assimilate. We probably want less immigration and more assimilation. "But caught in a paralysis of timidity and dishonesty, we still cannot enact the necessary plans for a workable solution." Rejecting historical determinism, Hanson maintains that our future is in our hands. He calls, therefore, for "honest discussion, without fear of recrimination and intimidation."

A VIEW FROM THE TRENCHES

Some 40 percent of our immigrants live in California. Half of all illegal immigrants are Mexican; our Hispanic population is over 70 percent Mexican. If current immigration continues, by 2050 America will have 97 million

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hispanics, 25 percent of America's population and over half of California's. What is new, Hanson argues, is not the immigration level but "a growing despair and uncertainty over how—or even whether—to assimilate the arrivals." Most Californians realize that they have made a "Devil's bargain" of admitting Mexican immigrants so as to escape menial labor. But since even timid attempts to discuss immigration honestly receive "the cheap slander of 'racist,'" most white Californians suppress their anger—and vent it in ballot propositions curtailing benefits for illegals.

Mexican immigration is unique, Hanson ably explains, because Mexico's proximity precludes immigrants' psychological amputation from their homeland and permits a steady influx of new immigrants, allowing immigrants to retain a Mexican milieu here. Both hamper assimilation. That white racism holds Mexicans back is only partially true, he argues, since it did not handicap Koreans, Armenians, and others, and in any case "belongs entirely to the past." Moreover, Mexico's government is complicit in our immigration problem. "Mexican elites rely on immigration northward as a means of avoiding domestic reform." They are "sitting on a demographic time bomb": a population of almost 100 million people growing at two percent a year, with provision of jobs, health care, etc. for such multitudes impossible. Without America receiving millions of her poor, Mexico might face either revolution or an African-style die-off.

Drawing on his farm experience, Hanson eloquently depicts the illegal alien's grim life. American teenagers won't pick crops, for good reason: it is physically hard. It pays well—provided you are young, healthy, and can find other work before you age. Crime and violence are pandemic; the Hispanic death rate from homicide is three times that of non-Hispanic whites. Drugs and drunkenness are pervasive; cirrhosis of the liver kills Hispanics at a higher rate than any other ethnic group, twice as frequently as whites. Likewise, sexually transmitted disease is widespread, and Hispanics have twice the HIV infection rate of the native white population. Vulnerable to many diseases, Hispanics are thirteen times as likely as whites to have tuberculosis.

Gradually illegals catch on that labor contractors and others are bilking them. They come to envy their rich white employers, and to realize despairingly that they are trapped: they will become decrepit and unemployable, and go on welfare. Those with large families are doomed to poverty and exhaustion. Their fates have a powerful demonstration effect on their sons, who opt instead to become gangsters and criminals. Assuming that Americans would understandably avoid dead-end labor, we blinked at the influx of poor Mexicans. "But what at first was a relief became a troubling dilemma, and is now a near-disaster," Hanson writes bluntly, revealing immigration's heavy burden on native Californians. His own life teems with immigrant drivers going off the road and wrecking his vineyard; aliens routinely dumping trash, including one trailer filled with garbage, beside and on his property ("perhaps

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is an atavism from the old country where trash is everywhere dumped outside city limits?"); Mexicans routinely trespassing to shoot wildlife, get drunk, and steal; vandalism and burglary. ("I pick up their needles and condoms, brandy bottles and tampons nightly near our farm pond. Some have tried to break into my house.") Increasingly, Hanson finds keeping Mexican illegals and gangsters off his land "a hopeless task;...some trespassers seem piqued that anyone in California should dare to insist on the archaic notion of property rights. One especially smart teenager told me in broken English, 'Hey, it's our land anyway—not yours.'"

So much for the immigrants' much-vaunted "strong values," and the poppycock that assimilation and American identity rest on assent to "propositions." On Hanson's evidence, Mexico's folkways jarringly differ from America's, which flow from the centuries-old northern European, especially English, ethos of privacy, private property, gratification deferral, and self-control, and owe nothing to "propositions" or libertarian abstractions. Hanson is a valuable corrective for fatuous immigrationists sheltered from immigration's ugly realities.

Hanson blasts giving illegals driver licenses without requiring documentation, while requiring it of legal Californians, which perversely rewards lawbreaking and penalizes the law-abiding, and the "bizarre" policy of granting instant citizenship to illegal aliens' infants upon birth in America. Vivid firsthand anecdotes illustrate the "exasperating" social costs of large numbers of illegal aliens, from hit-and-run drivers to the appalling loss of time and efficiency as banks and other institutions struggle with a clientele that does not understand English.

Handily, Hanson explodes the self-serving distortions of history by Hispanic grievance mongers. Many Hispanics prospered in America before 1970, and Mexico's history is rife with crime, cruelty, corruption, and violence. If Hanson's teachers met Mexican immigrants with "unapologetically coarse efforts to insist on assimilation," on the assumption that America was far superior to Mexico, that assumption, he frankly states, was grounded in observable fact. Unlike Mexican courts and police, ours were generally honest, and America was a better place for people trying to get ahead.

All this candor is welcome in a timid, dishonest era. Hanson's firsthand experience with immigration gives him special credibility, and his call for fearless, candid discussion is just what the doctor ordered.

Evasion and Denial

Deeper down, however, *Mexifornia* is profoundly disturbing. Hanson is no conservative. He dubs Pat Buchanan and other conservatives "reactionary," refers to "good-thinking liberals" deploring the defense

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

budget, and calls Operation Wetback, President Eisenhower's deportation of illegals, "infamous." A fervent racial liberal, dwelling in a town of integration and intermarriage, Hanson deems race "superficial and unimportant in my personal life." His liberalism leads him repeatedly into denial of reality, and worse.

A former resident of Mendota told Hanson that he left "when the last white people left"; another Mexican, living in Parlier, transferred his children to the nearby Kingsburg schools which have "lots of white people." Hanson interprets these as statements that these places had "too many unassimilated Mexicans...to ensure an American future for their children, a critical mass" making both towns resemble Mexico more than America, "and therefore less safe, secure and desirable places to live." Fair enough, but also an evasion of the reality that the real problem was not the presence of Mexicans but the absence of whites, and that a location's desirability usually depends on its being populated predominantly by whites. (And why are the societies created by whites the only ones which the world's nonwhite poor deem worth moving to?) Intellectuals, Hanson declares, insufficiently appreciate that such Western values as the sanctity of property and free markets "are not predicated on race or ethnicity, but on simple acceptance of a core set of rights and responsibilities." So why did these rights and responsibilities flourish above all in northern Europe? He proclaims, "The answer to our current dilemma has nothing to do with race. It has everything to do with the degree to which a society is openly Western, and can thereby create a culture that trumps its natural environment." But what Hanson doesn't grasp or won't admit is that Western civilization was produced by European whites and nobody else. It necessarily follows that being Western and adopting "a core set of rights and responsibilities" means adopting Western norms of conduct, which means—there is no escaping this—*acting white,* which means the answer has everything to do with race. The splendid performance of Hanson's white-acting Hispanic students proves this, but he fails to realize it.

Hanson's multicultural chapter reveals his confusions. He observes that Chicano studies remain in their 1970s mold, and whimperingly asks, "why should racism and oppression remain unchanged themes thirty years later," and can't we go from sixty-two such courses "to perhaps ten?" He finds Latino elites' fervor for bilingual education "baffling." Then he realizes that militant multiculturalism "emboldens the architects of separatism to demand even more concessions from appeasers." A good discussion of biased liberal journalism and the spoils system operated by Hispanic race hustlers follows, but Hanson stumbles again, asserting that "The professional Latino means well." As Churchill said of Stanley Baldwin, "Occasionally he stumbled over the truth, but hastily picked himself up and hurried on as if nothing had happened."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

California, Hanson declares, is "a great, though risky experiment in a truly multiracial society, united by a common language, culture and law," unknown since the Roman Principate. "But that subjugation of race to culture is forever a fragile state, not a natural condition. Each day it erodes if not actively maintained. Race, chauvinism, ethnicity creep hourly back into social life if not battled by citizens of strength and vision."

This, necessarily, is a devastating confession that a multiracial society is unnatural, resting on a denial of reality that must be ceaselessly willed—that this "experiment" isn't for this world, that it entails forcing people to go against the grain of human nature, and that it is therefore doomed. Let classics professor Hanson ponder a certain quotation from the Roman poet Horace: "*Naturam expelles furca, tamen usque recurret.*" "Expel nature with a pitchfork, and she still comes back."

Hanson would cure multiracialism's fragility by maximizing the dose. Repeatedly he touts racial intermarriage as part of our immigration solution. His dream is of a society in which all share the same values "and gradually become indistinguishable through integration, assimilation, and intermarriage." Clearly attempting to foist intermarriage on his readers, he refers to "our group commitment to intermarriage," when no such commitment exists. And if "[t]he answer has nothing to do with race," why is Hanson hell-bent on obliterating distinct races?

Hanson's fervor for miscegenation is part and parcel of liberalism's perennial utopian project of contriving harmony by erasing distinctions. When Deweyite education has crippled every mind, there won't be any more hurtful differences between bright and stupid. When socioeconomic classes vanish, so will class antagonisms. When all religions are attenuated to nonjudgmental niceness, there won't be any religious conflict. Universal androgynous libertinism will end gender and sexual-orientation friction. When separate nations disappear, so will wars. When there aren't any more races, there won't be any more racism. And we'll live happily ever after in the brotherhood of interchangeable ciphers.

Liberalism's Huxleyan dystopia collides with the most powerful human drive of all: self-preservation. As Russell Kirk wrote in another context, "It seems to be a law governing all life, from the unicellular inanimate forms to the highest human cultures, that every living organism of every genus and species endeavors, above all else, to preserve its identity."

Here we must also confront, "without fear of recrimination or intimidation," something very ugly. Here liberalism's evil emerges, like something unspeakable crawling out from underneath a rock. Why any white woman in her senses would want to marry an illegal alien who by Hanson's own account is far more likely than a white man to be sexually infected, diseased, drugged, drunken, impoverished, criminal, and homicidally violent, with no future to offer her, and likely too to mistreat her for being white, is not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

explained. That the probable fate of white women in such marriages is heartbreakingly grim goes unmentioned too; Hanson's commitment to fearless "honest discussion" has its limits. Yet this horror is what he apparently wants. Deep down, this man is a monster—or a fool. A devotee of economism ("Money always trumps race in America"), Hanson argues that globalization's popular culture and turbo consumption may provide short-term assimilation. They unite us in "shared appetites for material things that dissolve the old prejudices of race, class, language and culture." Though offensive, popular culture nevertheless assumes that "almost all Americans...find instant commonality with one another through the medium of desire." While it may harm long-term moral health, for now it is our "only tool" to prevent "racial separation and ethnic tribalism." Our "shared addiction" to popular culture "inexorably builds affinities across racial lines." Admittedly, this is a "Devil's bargain," trading "standards and taste for raw inclusiveness," but we're fortunate to have our popular culture. "No substitute for real civic education" in American heritage and values, it does "buy us a little time" before we must confront the "catastrophe" of our failure to control our borders and give millions an "elevated culture."

It is revolting to see a classics professor, of all people, lauding modernity's crass, demeaning reduction of people to sensate, glandular ciphers, bundles of appetites in search of gratification—and willing to sacrifice higher culture and civilized standards of being for a phony, skin-deep "assimilation." Hanson's argument is ridiculous; the September 11 terrorists long dwelled among us, consuming supposedly affinity-building popular culture, then slaughtered Americans anyway. And how we will give immigrants "elevated culture" after marinating them in lowest-common-denominator vulgarity is not explained.

Hanson is clutching at straws. And even if globalization could unite us, California's exploding water demand, the salinization of Central Valley croplands, China's hideous pollution and water crisis, and the coming peak and decline of global oil and gas extraction ineluctably doom consumerism. If consumerism fuels assimilation, what will irreversible economic contraction do?

He reassures us that "we are not quite killing each other, as happens daily in almost every multiracial society on the planet." But as Hanson must know, we *are* killing each other—America has much interracial violence and murder, mostly committed by nonwhites against whites. And this is yet another admission that multiracial societies are probably unworkable.

Hanson's muddles flow partly from failure to define the central concept of assimilation. "Assimilate" derives from the Latin *assimilare,* from *ad* plus *similare,* "to make like." My dictionary defines it as "To make similar or alike" and "To appropriate and incorporate into the substance of the appropriating body; to absorb." So assimilation means immigrants become like us, by adopting our values and folkways. We don't change, immigrants do—they "go

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

native." Hanson asserts that assimilation works "through both intermarriage and shared consumerism." The latter is trifling. The former is amalgamation, not assimilation. The difference is substantive, not semantic; amalgamation means *both* groups lose their identity.

Assimilation of immigrants in America does not mean miscegenation, wearing goofy T-shirts, or accepting a "proposition." It means acting white. This is not white supremacy, simply the truth that assimilation means adopting the ways of the host population; assimilation of whites in, say, Uganda means acting black. What else could it mean?

Yes and No

At the end, Hanson returns to reality—but only partially. Preserving the status quo, he rightly argues, will wreck California. We can keep open borders and insist on either assimilation sans bilingualism or separation, or we can slash immigration and let multiculturalism wither away with its clientele. Better, he argues, "to adopt sweeping restrictions on immigration and put an end to the separatist ideology along with the two-tier legal system for illegal aliens." Given this, "our present problems would vanish almost immediately," and wages would rise.

Hanson's proposal leaves millions of illegals here, so our problems would *not* "vanish." Deporting them and stopping immigration altogether would be better. This, however, is too much for him. Saying much that needs saying, *Mexifornia* is valuable, but *caveat, emptor!* Hanson's partial realism is welcome. But there is much that he has not faced or thought through. Sensible up to a point, *Mexifornia* is softheaded and ultimately subversive. "The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau."

John Attarian is an independent scholar and writer in Ann Arbor, Michigan. He is the author of ***Economism and the National Prospect*** *(2001),* ***Social Security: False Consciousness and Crisis*** *(2002), and* ***Immigration: Wrong Answer for Social Security*** *(2003).*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right Now!

A magazine of politics, ideas and culture

Britain's most outspoken magazine

Since 1993, *Right Now!* has been thinking the unthinkable and saying the unsayable with panache and style.

Our combination of respected interviewees and contributors, uncensored but thoughtful articles, international news, cutting gossip and arts coverage has earned us friends and enemies across the world.

Isn't it time you read the magazine everyone's talking about? Send for your free sample copy today.

Dept OQ,
Box 361,
78 Marylebone High Street,
London,
W1U 5AP,
United Kingdom.

***Telephone*:**
+44 1507 339 056

***E-mail*:**
rightnow@
compuserve.com

***Internet*:**
www.right-now.org

It's time for change

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Question of National Destiny

The South under Siege 1830–2000:
A History of the Relations between the North and the South
Frank Connor
Newnan, GA: Collards Publishing Company, 2002
$34.95

752 pages

Reviewed by William Scott

> They were fighting for the things for which men have always fought: family, faith, friends and country. For the ashes of their fathers and the temples of their gods.
>
> —Patrick J. Buchanan

The last decade has seen a resurgence of interest in the war that, more than any other, defined America's form of government—the 1861–1865 struggle by the Confederate States of America for withdrawal from the union created by colonial secession from Great Britain. This war continues to illuminate sharp divides in American political, social, and cultural thought 138 years after it effectively ended with Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox. It is a measure of the degree of unresolved conflict still extant that partisans of the conflict cannot agree even on the name by which the war should be called. The winners long ago decreed it a "civil war." But no honest person, Southern or otherwise, can seriously contend that the South was vying for control of the residual nation left after eleven Southern states began their bid for separation. Southerners will accept the neutral War between the States appellation (and even convinced Congress to pass a resolution to that effect in the 1920s, when political correctness was but a gleam in the eye of the Frankfurt School's odious minions). But, many Southerners see the war for what it really was—the War for Southern Independence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A number of books supporting the Southern cause have appeared recently, many by non-Southerners. Perhaps this reflects a growing consciousness of the ugliness liberalism has inflicted on America as well as a renewed appreciation for the essentially conservative character of the Old South. Most of these books have focused on historical aspects of the war: e.g. the causes of the war, the character of Abraham Lincoln, a more balanced view of the conditions imposed on African slaves, etc. Among the more useful are Charles Adams's *When in the Course of Human Events: Arguing the Case for Southern Secession*, Jeffery Hummell's *Emancipating Slaves, Enslaving Free Men*, Webb Garrison's *The Lincoln No One Knows*, Thomas DiLorenzo's *The Real Lincoln*, Greg Durand's *America's Caesar*, Robert Fogel and Stanley Engerman's *Time on the Cross* (1975, reissued in 1995), John C. Perry's *Myths and Realities of American Slavery*, and Donald Kennedy's *Myths of American Slavery*. Untainted by political correctness, they do much to weaken the ideological and moral chains imposed on the losers. However, most do not deal with the issues that were under contention during the war as they apply to modern Americans.

But nothing remains static for long, and once Pandora's box was opened, questioning the past was certain to lead to questions about the present. This is certainly the case with Frank Connor's *The South under Siege*. Connor devotes much of his massive 700–plus-page text to a review of the history of the South from the founding era up to the present. However, the underlying purpose is not to rehash history but to reawaken a spirit of cultural identity and activism among Southerners concerned with the direction America has taken in the half century since World War II.

> Today the U.S. social fabric continues to be shredded by a series of battles in a cultural war that was proclaimed clearly as such in the late 1980s. Today we see almost-daily battles over: preferential treatment of "victim" groups; the banishment of Christian values from the mores enforced by federal, state and local governments; unlimited sex and violence in our mass-entertainment media; the steady destruction of the family; theoretical rehabilitation versus real punishment of criminals; environmentalism as a means of totalitarian control; animal rights; and on and on and on....
>
> Actually, this cultural war has raged unabated since the 1830s, when Northern liberals decided to supplant Christianity with secular humanism as the official religion, and they selected the religious South as their battleground.

A key premise of Connor's book is that an ideological war has been fought against traditional Western culture and religious beliefs at least since Jean Jacques Rousseau and the French Revolution. The nature of this conflict is manifold: secular humanism vs. Christianity; mankind as inherently good and therefore perfectible vs. sinful humanity in need of a moral compass; concern for "oppressed" others vs. taking care of family, faith, and community first; government as all-powerful enforcer of social outcomes vs. government as an organic compact of the people. However expressed at any place and time, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conflict is always grounded in egalitarian universalism vs. the particularities of distinct peoples—a struggle aptly described by Lincoln's future Secretary of State, Senator William Seward, as an "irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring forces."

But layered on this conflict is another struggle that is rarely discussed—the age-old imperial desire of the avaricious and the powerful to control the course of political, social, and economic conditions in order to secure for themselves yet more wealth and power. Acting in concert, universalism and the desire for power have wrought much of the damage done to humanity in the last two centuries. In order to obtain or consolidate power, unscrupulous elites invariably wield the universalistic appeal to build a following among the disaffected, a power base from which to attack an organic culture targeted for destruction. Perhaps the best measure of Connor's exposition is his exploration of the impact of these forces. As he shows, the confluence of these two fellow travelers, fused together in the Republican Party of 1860, can accurately be said to have been the primary cause of the War of Northern Aggression. Universalism—in the form of radical abolitionism—inflamed Northern public opinion against the South, allowing wealthy Northern industrialists to consummate a war of imperial conquest against an economically exploited South determined to resist its own subjugation.

Most non-Southerners pay scant attention to the South's brief. Southern disavowal that slavery was the sole cause of the war is largely ignored—primarily due to decades of pervasive anti-Southern academic and media bias. And yet the Southern case is historically unassailable—a point that Connor is certainly not the first to elaborate. Although the two regions had cooperated to evict the British during the Revolution, they were different in many ways from the beginning. As David Hackett Fischer chronicles in *Albion's Seed*, Massachusetts's English settlers were led by East Anglian Puritans. Fischer describes them as being privately the most orderly and publicly the most violent people in America. The word "puritanical" long ago entered the language as a reflection of their domineering, self-righteous temperament. Joining them to the south, English midland Quakers settled Pennsylvania and the Delaware Valley, bringing to America the Society of Friends and its universalist dogma. (The synthesis of these two groups created a real case of attitude: *We believe in the brotherhood of mankind—and if you don't agree, we will kill you*.)

Virginia's British colonists included many Southwest English aristocrats and their retainers. Much of the rest of the South was populated by lowland Scots, northern border English, and Scotch-Irish Scots colonized into Northern Ireland by the Crown in an attempt to weaken Irish resistance. As a matter of history, the Puritans' English ancestors had waged wars of conquest against the Scots for a thousand years. In many ways, the struggle between North and South was but a continuation of the Scottish Presbyterian struggle for autonomy from England. (Concerning the American Revolution, no less an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority than Horace Walpole remarked to Parliament: "There is no use crying about it. Cousin America has run off with a Presbyterian parson, and that is the end of it.") Led by Virginia's aristocratic officer corps, the fighting élan of a Confederate infantry well fortified with Scotch-Irish frontiersmen fell short only through lack of numbers.

While North and South began the union with some degree of economic and demographic and thus political—parity, the North grew rapidly in population and industrial capacity in the first half of the nineteenth century. Consistent with its mercantilist mantra, the North favored the so-called "American System," the foremost exponent of which was the American statesman Henry Clay. Its fundamental tenets were threefold: high protective tariffs, central banking, and a system of federally financed internal improvements (railroads, canals, etc.)—all designed to profit the rich industrialists who backed the Federalist and Whig parties. The agrarian South was, by climate and circumstance, dependent on an economy built around cotton and other agricultural exports. Most manufactured goods were imported. The South stood to lose enormously by punitive Whig tariffs—at times as high as 47 percent—and it did. By 1860, roughly 85 percent of the federal government's revenue came from tariffs and excise taxes on Southern imports and exports. Since the Northern population outnumbered white Southerners by a factor of four to one, Southerners averaged roughly twenty-five times the per capita taxation of Northerners. The money, however, was spent almost entirely in the North. The patent unconstitutionality of this economic rape was sanctimoniously ignored by Northern politicians—who were paid good money to vote the interests of their Yankee masters.

By the 1850s, the Whig Party had begun to lose ground to the more popularly based Democratic Party. And then a new factor entered the scene. Abolitionism had grown in influence as its followers spewed forth the vilest and most hate-filled invective imaginable against the South. Sensing an opportunity finally to wrest political control from the demographically disadvantaged South, Northern industrialists cast their lot with the abolitionists—and the Republican Party was born. John Brown's raid at Harper's Ferry—in which he planned to arm Virginia's slaves and launch a genocidal massacre of white Southern men, women, and children alike—was funded by rich Northerners. (For the whole sordid story, see Otto Scott's *The Secret Six*.) The murderous Brown was hanged by Virginia but eulogized as a martyr in the Northern press and compared, favorably, to Jesus Christ. With the memory of the Haitian massacre of French planters, the bloody Nat Turner rebellion, and other racial horrors burned into Southern consciousness, Brown's lionization irretrievably alienated the South. It thus contributed directly to the onset of the war that followed the election of former Whig Abraham Lincoln.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Connor traces the often-ignored subjugation of the South during Reconstruction and the decades that followed, showing how the South was systematically exploited in ways that have been largely hidden from view. It took until 1900 for the South to achieve an economic status equivalent to that of 1860. Meanwhile, the rest of the country had advanced far beyond its mid-1800s status. As a single example, railroads owned by Northern robber barons such as J. P. Morgan set their freight rates so that shipments out of the South cost significantly more than shipments into the South. This placed an inescapable penalty on nascent Southern industry, perpetually disadvantaging it vis-à-vis Northern manufacturers. This differential, enforced by the U.S. government, endured until 1950.

Although the South formed a convenient early target for liberal wrath, the culture war has long since metastasized into a far broader assault. The corrosive cancer of political correctness reaches into virtually ever corner of the nation. Via this malicious tactic, aspects of Western society necessary to its continued cohesion and the survival of its founding peoples are attacked as evil. Loyalty to one's own kith and kin, one of the most fundamental of all human traits, becomes prejudice and racism. The dynamic expansion of the West, bringing civilization, order, and economic development to much of the world, becomes imperialism and oppression. Out of the cauldron of fanatical Marxism a new proletariat has arisen, consisting of racial minorities, feminists, homosexuals, and other "disadvantaged" groups.

Aiding and abetting by betrayal from within are sincere liberals. Lenin called them "useful idiots" because they naively believe the Marxist egalitarian party line and eagerly cooperate in its imposition, by force if necessary—the inevitable fruit of Puritanism realized.

The utility of moralistic causes and oppressed classes in consolidation of power by a ruling oligarchy is not well understood by most Americans; if it were, we would not be afflicted with the problems we have today. But, it was well understood by Southern statesmen. Perhaps the most eloquent was John C. Calhoun, the South Carolina senator who ranks with Thomas Jefferson as one of the foremost defenders of limited government in American history. In his postwar book *In Defense of Virginia*, Robert L. Dabney cited Calhoun's warning against federal use of the slavery issue to consolidate power.

> All our statesmen, of all parties, had taught us, not only that the reserved rights of the States were the bulwarks of the liberties of the people, but that emancipation by federal aggression would lead to the destruction of all other rights. A Clay, as much as a Calhoun, proclaimed that when abolition overthrew slavery in the South, it also would equally overthrow the Constitution. Calhoun, and other Southern statesmen, with a sagacity which every day confirms, had forewarned us, that when once abolition by federal aggression came, these other sure results would follow: that the same greedy lust of power which had meddled between masters and slaves, would assuredly, and for the stronger reason, desire to use the political weight of the late slaves against their late masters....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Connor's book is notable for covering topics other writers have avoided. His discussion of the role of certain Jewish groups in attacking not only the South but much of Western tradition will surprise many Southerners, who regard Jews as virtual co-religionists because of their centrality to the Bible. Connor finds balance, drawing a distinction between generations of Sephardic and German Jewish immigrants in the 1600s and 1700s vs. the wave of socialist-minded Russian Jews who entered America beginning in the 1880s. Earlier immigrants, he believes, joined the fabric of American life just as did tens and hundreds of thousands of British, Scottish, Irish, German, French, and Scandinavian colonials. Connor contends that many within the Russian group differed in that they were ideologically attuned to the same secular humanist pseudo-gospel that had inspired liberals since Rousseau. They quickly allied themselves with Northern liberals, forming a coalition that continues to this day.

Connor's proposed way ahead is public activism in opposition to liberalism's excesses, motivated by restored Calvinist morality. He is certainly correct about activism. Any restoration of Western cultural norms can result only from a popular movement grounded on the legitimate expression of cultural grievances. In fact, Southern organizations are gaining strength as they champion Confederate heritage issues. Equally important is the question of the Christian perspective as the basis for cultural restoration. So degenerate are many mainline denominations that the Social Gospel has replaced the real one. It seems likely that a sense of cultural identity must accompany any religious sentiment, else the movement will fall short of its goal.

This leads to a key question: What inspires Southerners to cling to the Lost Cause long after its memory has grown cold? A thoughtful neutral observer might say that the losers of any war remember the outcome longer than the winners. A Southerner might counter that, in the fundamental points contended by the war, the South was right. But the truth is likely to be found at a deeper, more fundamental level. While the South lost its struggle for separation, it did not lose its sense of identity. This sense of identity is a valuable commodity as immigration remakes America into a Third World country; as non-Christian and anti-Christian values displace America's historical European (and predominantly British) culture; and as growth of corporate and government power erodes the freedoms Americans once took for granted. Ultimately, the war was not about slavery vs. freedom, or about tariffs vs. free trade, or about states rights vs. a consolidated federal government, or even about Christianity vs. secular humanism—all of which causes have been suggested at one time or another.

Rather, the War for Southern Independence was a desperate struggle for the survival of a distinct people. In other words, it was a war for national existence—where "nation" is defined, as it has been throughout history, as a collection of related peoples, united by language, faith, culture, traditions, values, and, most important, shared bloodlines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Connor has tapped into the early stages of a potentially important political development—an emerging resurgence of Southern consciousness. There already exist several organizations operating within the political system—the League of the South, the Sons of Confederate Veterans, and the Council of Conservative Citizens, among others. The driving force behind each group is dissatisfaction with a nation remade in the image of global mercantilism, centralized government, secular humanism, and radical multiculturalism.

Standing against this onslaught, the Southern awakening is arguably the only truly revolutionary movement in America today.

To be sure, conventional conservatism—in the form of Second Amendment organizations, the Christian community, home schoolers, anti-abortion activists, anti-gay groups, fiscal conservatives, Tenth Amendment advocates, immigration control activists, and others—wields considerable influence. (If it did not, neo-conservatives would not be working so assiduously to co-opt it from within.) Elections are still won and lost as these groups energize members to work for issues and candidates and to show up at the polls. But most of these groups are single-issue oriented. The idea that their battle is part of a larger culture war and that strategic alliances are necessary for victory is beyond their ken. It can be legitimately asked: If any of these groups achieved complete victory, would America's trajectory through history change in any meaningful way? With the exception of the movement for immigration reform—which is at least as important as cultural renewal and certainly as urgent—a complete victory for any of these groups would serve as little more than a temporary dam across one tributary of the flood that is sweeping America.

Not so Southern resurgence. While still embryonic in form, the Southern awakening carries with it the historical, cultural, and moral legacy of an ultimate struggle for political sovereignty by a culturally distinct people. The Confederate Battle Flag, under increasing attack as a supposed symbol of slavery, is in reality the symbol of a nation in being through four years of conflict, pain, and tragedy. The Flag's supporters view it is as the legitimate symbol of the aspirations of America's republican founders—a mantle that supporters of the unitary state created by Abraham Lincoln's war of economic and cultural hegemony cannot claim despite some of the most bizarre rhetorical contortions ever uttered. While some may question the value of fighting heritage battles, in reality they serve a vital purpose. All struggles must have symbols and issues that arouse people from lethargy and inspire their participation. Southern heritage is such an issue. Its symbols are potent icons of cultural identity—an explicit and unmistakable rallying point for resistance.

Once set in motion, who is to say where this struggle will lead—or whether it will remain confined to the South? Indeed, many Southern activists would argue that they are already on the front line of the wider culture war. It is not surprising that the left fears the South and devotes inordinate resources to its suppression. Its intentions set firmly on global empire, the ruling oligarchy is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not so foolish as to miss the meaning of Southern symbols—or the power they convey to their defenders. Though still small, fragile, and divided, the new Southern consciousness has the latent potential to completely thwart the left's goals—a destiny directly attributable to the one characteristic that distinguishes it from all other conservative ideals. Unlike its apparent siblings, it is not about a single issue—the immediate focus of Battle Flag defenders notwithstanding. Indeed, the Southern cause is not about an issue at all. It is about the cultural identity of a people and the intrinsic sense of distinctiveness they must possess in order to survive. It is about nationhood—the one force that, throughout history, has stood between oligarchies and their consolidation of empire.

The urge that impels its adherents onward is buried deep within—often inchoate, rarely conscious. But it is all the more powerful for that—an ineradicable imprint passed down through countless generations of forebears. It will rise up again, Phoenix-like, with each new generation. William Faulkner captured its essence in *Intruder in the Dust:*

> For every Southern boy fourteen years old, not once but whenever he wants it, there is the instant when it's still not yet two o'clock on that July afternoon in 1863. . .and it's all in the balance, it hasn't happened yet, it hasn't even begun yet, it not only hasn't begun yet but there is still time for it not to begin against that position and those circumstances which made more men than Garnett and Kemper and Armistead and Wilcox look grave, yet it's going to begin, we all know that, we have come too far with too much at stake and that moment doesn't need even a fourteen-year-old boy to think *This time. Maybe this time. . .*

William Scott is a Virginia-based Southern writer and activist.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LESSONS IN GENETICS AND EUGENICS

DNA: The Secret of Life
James D. Watson with Andrew Berry
New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003
$39.95
446 pp.

Reviewed by Leslie Jones

In his *Inquiries into Human Faculty* (1883), Sir Francis Galton deplored the suffering and waste of life contingent on evolution by natural selection. As regards man, he advocated more merciful and rational methods of selection. Yet Galton also acknowledged the "…present imperfect knowledge of the limitations and conditions of hereditary transmission." This disjuncture between the ambitious goals of eugenics and its earlier exponents' limited understanding of how heredity worked is explored in James Watson's new book. Published on the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the double helix, *DNA: The Secret of Life* is a manifesto for a new, libertarian eugenics based on our enhanced understanding of heredity.

EUGENICS: A RETROSPECTIVE

DNA: The Secret of Life commences with a chapter that purports to be an objective history of eugenics but has the contentious title "Beginnings of Genetics: From Mendel to Hitler." Watson recalls that in 1948, when he first came to Cold Spring Harbor, the location of the Eugenics Record Office, nobody would use the "E word" and that human genetics had "a major public relations problem" because of its previous association with eugenics. This is something of an understatement.

The author's critique of eugenics consists of two main elements. First, he questions its scientific status. He has some particularly harsh words for one of his predecessors as director of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, the biologist Charles B. Davenport. In 1910, Davenport established the Eugenics Record

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Office nearby and appointed Harry H. Laughlin as its superintendent. Mendel's laws had been rediscovered in 1900, and Davenport applied Mendelian analysis to the pedigrees that he assiduously constructed.

Had Davenport confined his research program to such simple traits as albinism and Huntington's disease, Watson would have no complaint. These traits are caused by a particular mutation in a particular gene and are barely affected by the environment. But Davenport also applied Mendel's laws to complex behavioral traits, such as alcoholism, that are affected by many genes and by environmental factors. In Watson's judgment, Davenport's research was "deeply flawed." The author also maintains that because the science driving eugenics was "bogus," it became a vehicle for the racial and social prejudices of its supporters.

However, Rushton (2002a) has examined the archives at the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory and the Laughlin archives in Missouri. He acknowledges that many of the behavioral traits that interest scientists, notably intelligence, are not transmitted as "unit characters" in simple Mendelian fashion but are inherited polygenically. He nevertheless insists that Davenport's research orientation was scientific. He also points out that the heritability of human behavioral traits, as posited by Davenport, is beyond question. Professor Lynn (2001) concurs. He notes that Davenport discovered that a single dominant gene causes Huntington's disease. Lynn concludes that despite the errors of certain eugenicists, notably psychologist Carl Brigham's inference from the U.S. Army Tests that the Alpine and Mediterranean races are genetically inferior to the Nordics, eugenics was predominantly scientific. And Resta (1998) remarks that the two major clinical genetics journals in the United States continue to employ the Davenport pedigree style.

The academic world is currently tyrannized by political correctness, in Watson's opinion. Ironically, the second element in his critique of eugenics, the exegesis of its "horrendous…consequences," illustrates this contention. The author uncritically endorses Kevles's canard as to the links between American eugenics and the Nazi Holocaust. Kevles (1995) claims that Laughlin's influence ensured the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 that restricted immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe. The tragic unintended consequence of this act, according to Watson, was the abandonment of German Jewry to its fate.

Kevles and Watson discern a further connection between American eugenics and the Nazis. They argue that the German sterilization law of 1933 was based on the model elaborated by Laughlin (as did Laughlin). *En passant*, Professor Watson makes a pointed reference to the latter's expertise in chicken breeding.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Daniel Kevles, Watson's principal source on the history of eugenics, states, "The Nazi horrors discredited eugenics as a social program." He thereby conflates eugenics and German National Socialism. Yet although there were contacts between the American, British, and German eugenicists (Mazumdar, 1998), the eugenics movement was always pluralistic, to quote Rushton's apt description (Rushton, 2002a). Support for eugenics spanned the ideological spectrum, despite Watson's attempts to associate it exclusively with the "white supremacism" of Madison Grant and the "racist ranting" of Hitler.

Lynn (2001) disputes the responsibility of the German scientific eugenicists, let alone their American counterparts, for the "final solution." Self-evidently, compulsory sterilization in the United States was a far cry from genocide. The conflation of eugenics and the "final solution" also involves assigning what Rushton (2002a) calls "guilt by remote association." Witness Watson's observation that Laughlin received an honorary degree from Heidelberg University in 1936 and his gratuitous comment that Laughlin "had his fans among the Nazis."

Somewhat fittingly, Watson has himself become a victim of "guilt by remote association." Despite his forthright condemnation of Hitler's program of medical killing, Watson has been accused of emulating the Nazis! His zealous advocacy of extensive genetic screening and of a woman's right to abort a fetus with "deleterious genes" reminded the president of the German Federal Chamber of Medical Doctors of the concept of "life not worth living" (*lebensunwertes Leben*), as employed by the Nazis but elaborated before 1933 by the jurist Karl Binding and by Alfred Hoche, professor of psychiatry at Freiburg.

Nature and Nurture

Although Watson does not deny the influence of nurture, he is struck by its limits. These are most dramatically expressed in cases of profound genetic disadvantage. He cites the example of boys with severe Fragile X syndrome. Boys affected are mentally retarded and can suffer from a distressing range of behavioral problems. Medicine can do nothing to help them. In *The Lives to Come*, Philip Kitcher eloquently describes the "unending anguish" of their parents.

For the author, the slow learner is another example of the limits of nurture. He disputes the theory that poverty is the cause of low IQ. As he observes, no amount of extra tuition will enable a slow learner to excel. Children will inevitably get left behind if we assume that all individuals have the same potential for learning. James Watson does not mention A. R. Jensen by name but he is evidently familiar with his work. By taking ability differences into account, Jensen (1998) contends that educators could design far more effective programs of education.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Like Jensen, Watson believes that scientific knowledge, however unsettling, is better than ignorance. An understanding of the biochemical basis of individual differences in mental ability would be a boon to educators, in Watson's view. He underlines the importance of Robert Plomin's research at the Institute of Psychiatry, University of London. Using a painstaking method called quantitative trait loci, Plomin has compared the DNA of samples of very bright children with DNA from samples of children with average IQ. On chromosome 6, he has found at least 4 genes or DNA segments that affect IQ (Miele, 2002). Watson recalls that in America Plomin encountered so much opposition to his work that he "decamped" to England.

As Galton (1883) observes, the nurture-nature controversy has arisen because man "is so educable an animal." Concerning their relative weight, Watson complains that Galton only paid lip service to the effects of environment. In *Hereditary Genius* (1869), Galton claimed that talent runs in families. But Watson maintains that in Galton's day, the son of a judge was much more likely to be a judge than was the son of a peasant. In similar vein, several contemporary critics of *Hereditary Genius* thought that Galton had ignored the social disadvantages that hinder many a "mute inglorious Milton" (Soloway, 1995). They also disputed Galton's claim that talent will always out. Not surprisingly, Galton subsequently turned to twin studies as an alternative method of ascertaining the relative contributions of environment and heredity.

Writing in *The Times* in June 1873, Galton opined that because Negroes lack self-control and foresight they are unable to sustain the burden of civilization without "external guidance." Today, in contrast, the almost obligatory view is that there are no significant behavioral differences between racial groups. In *The Blank Slate*, Steven Pinker says that a genetic explanation for the average black-white IQ difference in the United States is unnecessary. As Rushton (2002b) pithily remarks, "This book sweeps blank slate orthodoxy into the dustbin of history. One only wishes Pinker had used a wider and stiffer broom."

Where does Watson stand on this vexed issue? According to Cann and Wilson's analysis of mitochondrial DNA sequence variation, all living humans share a common ancestor who lived merely 150,000 years ago. This estimate was independently corroborated in a separate study carried out under the auspices of Luca Cavalli-Sforza, at Stanford, by tracking the lineage of the Y chromosome. Watson infers that there has simply not been enough time for geographically separate populations to diverge significantly and that race specific differences are very limited. In one passage, he agrees with Cavalli-Sforza (1997) that they are confined to skin color and body shape.

This conclusion, however, is hard to reconcile with Watson's comments on the IQ deficit of African-Americans and the global superiority of the average IQ of East Asians. Unlike Pinker (2002), Watson does not automatically assume

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that these racial differences in mental ability *must be* exclusively cultural. He suggests that Herrnstein and Murray's thesis that these differences probably have a genetic component requires further investigation.

Toward a Eugenic Utopia?

In any random group of a thousand men, some would be "…crippled, insane, idiotic, and otherwise born incurably imperfect in body or mind" (Galton, 1883). Watson is no less struck by "the cruel arbitrariness of genetic disadvantage and defect, particularly as it blights the lives of children." As he remarks, a child who dies of Tay-Sachs is a victim of natural selection.

Professor Jensen points out that negative eugenics is currently practiced throughout the world through genetic counseling, amniocentesis, and DNA testing for genetic disease (Miele). Like Jensen, Watson is a supporter of laissez-faire eugenics. This term, coined by the philosopher Philip Kitcher (1996), denotes the application of genetic knowledge and biotechnology that is strictly subordinated to the needs and wishes of the individual. State-controlled eugenic programs that curtail personal reproductive choice are anathema to Watson. He regards eugenics and feminism (in particular, the right to abortion on demand) as naturally complementary, since women bear the immediate consequences of genetic defects in their offspring.

Genetic enhancement is the improvement of a child's intelligence and personality by inserting suitable genes into the fetus soon after conception. Watson believes that it is both desirable and eminently feasible. He dismisses the notion that what is natural is best.

Francis Fukuyama, for one, fears that genetic enhancement could destroy our already fragile sense of a common humanity (Pinker, 2003). Other doomsayers envisage an immutable genetic caste system. They emphasize the existing unequal access to medical resources and claim that selfishness and nepotism are hardwired into human nature. Watson suspects that "the dark passage of the eugenics movement" encourages this visceral opposition to genetic enhancement.

Yet regardless of these reservations, Watson believes that genetic enhancement will inevitably arise on the foundations of an existing biotechnology that cannot be suppressed. Lynn (2001) likewise argues that in the market economies, the demand for the eugenic use of biotechnology will eventually become irresistible, given the understandable wish of couples to have children with desirable genetic characteristics. Like Lynn, Watson predicts that authoritarian states such as China will have no compunction about using embryo selection and the techniques of gene therapy to increase the intelligence of their populations and thereby enhance their power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Qua history, *DNA: The Secret of Life* is flawed. How does it rate as futurology? Pinker (2003) has underlined the frailty of most technological predictions, including those transformations deemed "inevitable." Watson acknowledges the risks and dangers of gene improvement and Pinker discerns here a major obstacle to its development. What parent, he demands, would accept a small risk of retardation in the hope of achieving a moderate amount of improvement? Because humans are selfish and nepotistic, genetic enhancement is arguably undesirable. And because parents love their children, contra Watson it may not be inevitable.

Leslie Jones is a member of the Galton Society and a London-based freelance writer.

References

Cavalli-Sforza, L. & F. 1997. *Qui sommes-nous? Une histoire de la diversité humaine.* Paris: Flammarion.

Galton, F. 1908. *Inquiries into human faculty and its development*. 2nd ed. London: J.M. Dent. 1st ed. 1883.

Jensen, A.R. 1998. "The g factor and the design of education," in R. J. Sternberg and W. M. Williams (eds.), *Intelligence, instruction, andassessment.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum. 111–131.

Kevles, D.J. 1995. *In the name of eugenics: Genetics and the uses of human heredity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Kitcher, P. 1996. *The lives to come: The genetic revolution and human Possibilities*. London: Penguin Press.

Lynn, R. 2001. *Eugenics: A reassessment*. London: Praeger.

Mazumdar, P. 1998. "Eugenics: The pedigree years," in *Human Pedigree Studies*. 18–44.

Miele, F. 2002. *Intelligence, race, and genetics: Conversations with Arthur R. Jensen.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview.

Pinker, S. 2002. *The blank slate: The modern denial of human nature*. London: Allen Lane.

———. 2003. "The designer baby myth," *The Guardian, Life. June 5, 2003*. 8–9.

Resta, R. 1999. "A brief history of the pedigree in human genetics," in *Human pedigree studies*. London: The Galton Institute. 62–84.

Rushton, J.P. 2002a. "The Pioneer Fund and the scientific study of human differences," *Albany Law Review*. 66: 207–262.

———. "Sweeping away culture-only orthodoxy—almost," review of *The blank slate*. 2002b. amazon.com

Soloway, R. A. 1995 *Demography and degeneration: Eugenics and the declining birthrate in twentieth-century Britain.* Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HONORING AN IQ ICONOCLAST

The Scientific Study of General Intelligence

Tribute to Arthur R. Jensen
(Ed.) Helmuth Nyborg
New York: Pergamon, 2003
$125
642 pp.

Reviewed by Kevin Lamb

Scan the shelves in the psychology section of Borders, Barnes and Noble, or any major retail bookseller and one will find scores of titles by Jung, Freud, Robert Sternberg, Howard Gardner, Steven Pinker, Daniel Goleman, Anthony Robbins, Jerome Kagan, John Gray, James Hillman, Dr. Phil, and Laura Schlesinger. It's not unusual to find a well-stocked psychology section in a quality bookstore; what is unusual is finding *quality* amidst this *quantity*: substantially solid books that challenge politically correct orthodoxy. From the serious to the sublime, a reader can find books on psychoanalysis, addictions, relationships, personality theory, educational psychology, testing, and history of psychology, not to mention the more voluminous pop-psych and self-help themes.

The Bell Curve was a departure from this literary sub-culture – a rarity that maintains a lasting market value given its steady appeal as a runaway controversial bestseller. The hostile reception that the book's high-profile launch received upon publication generated widespread interest, especially after hostile reviewers unleashed a barrage of scathing critiques and ad hominem attacks on the book's authors, Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray. (*The Bell Curve* is still available in quality paperback on retail bookstore shelves nearly a decade after the publication of its first-edition hardcover.) However, the bulk of psychology titles that major retail bookstores stock and *promote* are dominated by a politically correct uniformity that either avoids such "divisive" issues as racial differences in IQ (pretending that these differences are merely cosmetic) or bolsters racial egalitarianism by attributing these differences to environmental (non-biological) causes. Scholarly books

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that deviate from this politically correct genre are usually published by vanity mail-order publishers and therefore ignored by the major book reviewer periodicals, such as the *New York Review of Books*, *New Yorker,* or *Times Literary Supplement*. Try finding a copy of Arthur Jensen's *The g Factor* or Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen's *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* in a retail bookstore.

Helmuth Nyborg's *The Scientific Study of General Intelligence*, an edited collection of tributes to the work of Arthur R. Jensen, is the most recent work of substance to fail the big chains' litmus test of political correctness. Students of IQ will either have to order it directly from the publisher, Elsevier-Pergamon, or from amazon.com. Although the price is quite steep, the book is well worth the investment. Nyborg brings together a treasure trove of contemporary research findings from leading experts on a range of issues that emphasize the importance of general intelligence, including the views of a few skeptics of Jensen's work. The contributors to this festschrift span the full range of Jensen's research interests and experiences as a pioneer in differential psychology, most are primarily behavioral geneticists who examine the interface between nature and nurture on a variety of physical and behavioral traits. In essence, differential psychologists who analyze the heritability of traits in populations.

When one considers the full scope and magnitude of Jensen's scholarship, including the quality of his work over a remarkable and tumultuous career, it isn't too surprising to find that his own colleagues—fellow academics who know him quite well, including respectable critics who disagree with Jensen—hold him in high esteem. In a survey of 1,725 members of the American Psychological Society that solicited the top 100 psychologists of the twentieth century (published in the July/August 2002 *Review of General Psychology*), Jensen ranked no. 47. This evaluation is at odds with the portrayal that Jensen's detractors have successfully cultivated in the mass media over the years. Consider the following headline of a *Daily Mail* article from September 17, 1999, that covered Jensen's visit to London: "Is This Man Truly the World's Most Loathsome Scientist?" The article went on to identify Jensen as "the world's most demonized scientist": a typical example of the sort of press coverage Jensen has received over the years.

Yet compare the manufactured image of Jensen the academic "racist" with the regard in which the Berkeley psychologist is held by many of those who studied under him. Philip A. Vernon, professor of psychology at the University of Western Ontario, writes about the influences that Jensen had in shaping his graduate work:

> As a research advisor, Arthur was the perfect model. His own research is methodologically rigorous and is incredibly productive. He allowed me (and the other students working with him at that time) considerable freedom in choosing research topics, but he was also always available for consultation and advice when needed. Through his own example, I know that he brought out the best in me, and I have continued to value his comments and suggestions on work-in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> progress ever since. I also valued Arthur's willingness to tackle topics that, due to their controversial nature, often led to his being criticized, and sometimes demonstrated against and even physically attacked. He was a staunch believer that knowledge is always preferable to ignorance—no matter what the topic—and he never allowed the opinions of others to stop him from doing what he believed in: this was a lesson well worth learning.

Another former graduate student, Steven M. Paul, a faculty member at the University of California-San Francisco, recalls his experiences with Professor Jensen:

> Honesty, integrity, and accuracy, these are the words that first come to mind when I reflect on my impressions of Dr. Arthur Jensen…. I was lucky enough to serve as his research assistant for many years. I learned more from our private conversations and work together than from the many formal courses I have taken over the years…. Although his academic standards and accomplishments are perhaps the first things that come to mind, I also remember how impressed I was with his humanity and nonacademic pursuits. Arthur Jensen is a true man of the world. His interests, skills, and passions are astounding.

Several other testimonials by former graduate students offer a more complete picture of Jensen as a first-rate instructor, mentor, and advisor. The fact that he has managed to persevere in the face of death threats, classroom brawls, on-campus police escorts, cancelled lectures, stringent peer-review standards, and unexplained book cancellations by publishers attests to Jensen's stamina and resilience in his quest to resolve unanswered difficult questions that most would otherwise avoid. The average scholar would have been driven into more vocationally acceptable avenues of research that would have guaranteed a smoother career path. Jensen's diligence, exemplified in his 1969 *Harvard Educational Review* article, "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" would have been a steppingstone to fame and prominence if the topic had been anything other than racial and genetic differences in intelligence. The fact that it triggered a cascade of death threats, protests, postponed lectures, and negative publicity that continues to this day speaks volumes about the issue of media bias and *managed* news. Do we really value a society that fosters ideological myths (human equality) at the expense of empirically corroborated truths (human differences)? Are college-educated adults simply incapable of assessing or uninterested in deciphering the empirical realities about the genetic and racial correlates of intelligence?

John Carroll, professor emeritus at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, perhaps the foremost authority on factor analytic studies of cognitive abilities, explores the evidence for the general or *g* factor in a definitive chapter on the nature of *g* and its relationship with lower-level cognitive abilities. The debate among IQ authorities that has consumed much time and energy since Charles Spearman's pioneering 1904 paper on general intelligence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is whether the concept of intelligence is a single unified factor, a nexus of broad specialized abilities, or whether the term represents an uncorrelated composite of smaller, independent abilities.

To the layman this may seem to be the latter-day equivalent of determining how many angels actually dance on the head of a pin, but to scores of researchers over the years this question has shifted from one position to the next, depending, as Carroll points out, on how the analysis of the research has been conducted. His own research, published in a landmark 1993 study, *Human Cognitive Abilities*, accepts what he refers to as the "standard multifactorial view." It recognizes "the existence of a general factor and of a series of non-general 'broad' factors" in a hierarchical three-level stratum. Some researchers reject the idea that a general factor can be extracted from a lower stratum of cognitive abilities, but as Carroll explains, the evidence to date from known datasets of empirical studies points to the existence of a general factor, although he adds that the jury is still out in terms of reaching a definitive conclusion because, in his own view, there isn't enough objective evidence to settle this dispute once and for all. Jensen's monumental 1998 study *The g Factor* has decisively tipped the scales toward the conventional psychometric view.

Robert Plomin, a leading behavioral geneticist with the Institute of Psychiatry in London, highlights the genetics of intelligence in a chapter that explains Jensen's contributions to this field, the important discoveries that are currently coming to the fore, and the pitfalls that Plomin and others have encountered at the molecular research level. Developing technologies that augment this later area of genetic research are making it easier to identify and scan DNA markers. As to Jensen's contributions to this area of study, Plomin explains that:

> Although a review of behavioral genetic research on *g* was published in *Science* in 1963 (Erlenmeyer-Kimling & Jarvik 1963), it was Arthur Jensen's *Harvard Educational Review* monograph (Jensen 1969) that made it no longer possible to avoid the issue in the social and behavioral sciences. He clearly and carefully described quantitative genetic theory with a minimum of jargon, reviewed the data, and concluded that individual differences in IQ scores are substantially due to genetic differences. The section of the monograph entitled "The inheritance of Intelligence" (pp. 28-59) is still one of the best introductions to the genetics of *g*.

Contributors Richard Lynn and J. Philippe Rushton scrutinize the evidence for racial differences in *g*. Lynn considers the geographic and racial parallels to regional IQ patterns in populations around the world. He notes that "[T]his association between intelligence and race is sufficiently close for it to be possible to predict the approximate IQs of nations and of sub-populations within nations from their racial identity." Lynn explains the significance of these global IQ data:

> The studies surveyed in this chapter show that the IQs of the world's populations vary consistently with their race. There is no environmental theory that can explain this. The only conclusion that can be drawn from this association is that race is the most important determinant of the IQs of populations….

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> With regard to the intelligence differences between blacks and whites in the United States, the consistency of the black-white differences worldwide corroborates the thesis that genetic factors are largely responsible for the difference in the United States. We have seen that whites from North West Europe, which is where the ancestors of most American whites came from, almost invariably have IQs close to 100, whether they are in Europe, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, or South Africa, while blacks in sub-Saharan Africa invariably obtain IQs in the range of 62-78. The IQ of blacks in the United States is around 85 and hence substantially higher than the IQs of blacks in sub-Saharan Africa. There are two explanations for this. The first is that American blacks are a hybrid population with about 25% of white ancestry (Reed 1969; Chakraborty et al. 1992). According to genetic theory this would raise their IQs above the level of blacks in Africa. The second is that American blacks live in a society run by whites and enjoy much higher standards of living, nutrition, education and health care than they have in societies run by blacks. This enriched environment can be expected to have some advantageous impact on their IQ. When we look at the IQs of blacks in Africa we have to conclude that living in a white society has raised rather than lowered the IQs of American blacks.

Rushton traces Jensen's methodology in reevaluating the essence of the 15-18 point black-white IQ difference. Jensen's theoretical concept of intelligence shifted from his Level I-Level II abilities to Spearman's general factor of intelligence after re-reading Spearman's work, especially his 1927 classic *The Abilities of Man*. Conceptually the *g* factor provided a better, more comprehensive explanation for the racial differences in intelligence. In 1985, Jensen published an influential paper in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, which reviewed the data from major comparative studies on the black-white IQ gap. His analysis shifted to Spearman's *g* factor as an explanation for this well-established IQ differential. Jensen found that the black-white intelligence difference was more pronounced on IQ tests that had a greater *g*-loading across the mental tasks on various tests. Rushton elaborates on the evolution of his own research, taking up the gauntlet and discovering additional physical and behavioral correlates that further confirm the genetic hypothesis of the black-white gap. In an impressive summary of the evidence to date, Rushton believes that researchers are gradually accepting Jensen's "default hypothesis" as an explanation for racial differences in *g* primarily because "Jensen has gone beyond proving the statistical reality and predictive validity of the general factor."

Aside from the more personal aspects of Jensen's own struggles against the forces of political correctness, the balance of the festschrift addresses the societal consequences that the *g* factor can exert in a variety of applied circumstances. Linda Gottfredson, a psychologist at the University of Delaware, reviews the literature on the importance of *g* in the workplace. The *g* factor remains the single best predictor of job performance in the workplace and offers a useful tool for human resource and personnel departments in making decisions over hiring and promotions. She extrapolates the mounting

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

data in personnel psychology and applies the lessons to situations in everyday life. Another chapter by Anthony Walsh and Less Ellis describes the shift in thinking among criminologists to recognize the predictive validity of IQ in criminality. This is another area in which early psychological pioneers, such as H. H. Goddard, reviewed the evidence and found a strong correlation between low average intelligence levels and recidivist criminal conduct.

One of the more interesting chapters assesses the practical and legal implications of rival concepts of intelligence for employee selection. Despite the media fascination with relatively untested theories such as Goleman's "emotional intelligence," Howard Gardner's "multiple intelligences," and Sternberg's "practical intelligence," the empirical void that these theories have failed to fill and the lack of credible solid evidence to substantiate these largely unproven assumptions, the authors conclude, would not hold up in court when challenged in an adverse-impact discrimination law suit. The court has established what are known as the "Daubert Standards" for granting the admissibility of scientific evidence. The criteria were set forth in *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals* (1993):

1. The theory must have been tested, or is at least able to be tested.
2. The theory (and expert) must have (been) published in peer-reviewed publications.
3. There must be a known or potential error rate.
4. The theory must be generally accepted in the relevant scientific community.
5. The methods for testing the theory must meet scientific standards.

The authors demonstrate the legal hurdles that these rival intelligence theories must cross if their widespread use is deemed to be useful in selecting qualified personnel while simultaneously minimizing adverse impact toward minority applicants. Even though a combination of personality tests and non-conventional IQ tests *may* theoretically lower the degree of adverse impact and increase the validity of the combined screening measures, the applied experience has led to mixed results—lower adverse impact in some cases and higher in others. The problem still remains: the track record has yet to produce a valid alternative to established general ability or IQ tests, which would be equally valid as a reliable measure of intelligence and, in their widespread use, reduce adverse impact in employment selection.

Over the years, Jensen's critics, especially in the media, have dismissed his research findings, to put it more charitably, as those of an eccentric crank with a social-policy ax to grind. Such a simplistic and erroneous view overlooks not only his own record of maintaining a straightforward adherence to objective scientific analysis, and a meticulous degree of thoroughness in carrying out his responsibilities as a researcher, but also fails to apply the same standards of skepticism and scrutiny to critics of *g* who are pushing their own egalitarian social agenda. Recently I picked up, second-hand, one of the more "scholarly"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

critiques of *The Bell Curve,* a book co-authored by six faculty members in the sociology department at the University of California-Berkeley and published by Princeton University Press in 1996, titled *Inequality By Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth.* It received some reviews in the popular press at the time of its publication, including a glowing account of the authors in the *San Francisco Chronicle* that lauded *Inequality By Design* for "attack[ing] *The Bell Curve* authors' data analysis, not just their motives or conclusions." I couldn't help but notice the inscription on the front flyleaf by one of the book's co-authors: "May these words aid you in the struggle for social justice—Samuel R. Lucas." Nothing like objectivity.

Kevin Lamb is the editor of ***The Occidental Quarterly*** *and* ***Race, Genetics & Society: Glayde Whitney on the Scientific and Social Policy Implications of Racial Differences*** *(Scott-Townsend).*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

About the Editors

- **Editor**

Kevin Lamb, a Hoosier native and graduate of Indiana University, with undergraduate degrees in political science and journalism, is a conservative freelance writer who has published in several periodicals, including *National Review*, *Chronicles*, *The Asian Wall Street Journal*, *Society*, *Mankind Quarterly*, *Conservative Review*, and *The Journal of Social, Political & Economic Studies*, and is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract* and *Right Now!* A former intern at the National Journalism Center (Washington, D.C.) and former Marine reservist, Mr. Lamb resides with his family near Washington, D.C.

- **Associate Editor & Book Editor**

Samuel Francis, Ph.D., is a graduate of Johns Hopkins University (B.A., 69) and the University of North Carolina (M.A., 71; Ph.D. 79) and former policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation as well as a former U.S. Senate staff member. Formerly an award-winning staff columnist with *The Washington Times*, where he served as editorial writer, 1986-91, and deputy editorial page editor, 1987-91, Dr. Francis writes a nationally syndicated column, is a contributing editor to *Chronicles*, where he writes a monthly column, "Principalities and Powers,"and is currently editor-in-chief of the *Citizens Informer*. He is the author of *The Soviet Strategy of Terror*, Heritage Foundation, 1981; *Power and History: The Political Thought of James Burnham*, University Press of America, 1983; *Beautiful Losers: Essays on the Failure of American Conservatism*, University of Missouri Press, 1993; and *Revolution from the Middle*, Middle American Press, 1996. His writings have appeared in major newspapers and magazines, including *The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *National Review*, and *The Spectator* (London). Dr. Francis also serves on the Board of Editorial Advisors of *Modern Age: A Quarterly Review*.

- **Web Edition Editor**

Louis Andrews is a graduate of the College of Charleston (B.S., 66) and did graduate work in the Department of History at the University of South Carolina. He is a businessman, web developer, and writer and has been published in *Right Now!,* the *Augusta Chronicle*, and the online journal *pinc,* for which he served as book review editor. He is also the developer and webmaster of the Stalking the Wild Taboo website. Though a native of South Carolina, Mr. Andrews has lived in Augusta, Georgia, since 1982.

- **Associate Editor**

Theodore J. O'Keefe studied history and classics at Harvard College. During his career in publishing he has edited several racial-nationalist and historical revisionist periodicals and helped bring numerous books on European and American history and culture into print. Mr. O'Keefe has also published many articles on the political and cultural aspects of our civilization's contemporary crisis.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Advisory Board

Virginia Abernethy, Ph.D., emeritus professor of psychiatry, Vanderbilt University Medical School, is the author of *Population Politics: The Choices that Shape Our Future* (Insight Books, 1993; Transaction 1999), *Population Pressure and Cultural Adjustment* (Human Sciences Press, 1979), and (editor) *Frontiers in Medical Ethics: Applications in a Medical Setting* (Ballinger, 1980). A former editor of *Population and Environment*, she is the author of numerous articles in professional journals and a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. She is a graduate of Wellesley College (B.A., 1955) and Harvard University (M.A. 1969, Ph.D., 1970).

Frank Ellis, Ph.D., is a lecturer in Russian at the University of Leeds, England, and the author of *Vasily Grossman: The Genesis and Evolution of a Russian Heretic* (Berg, 1994), *From Glasnost to the Internet: Russia's New Infosphere* (St. Martin's Press, 1999), and *The Macpherson Report: 'Anti-racist' Hysteria and Sovietization of the United Kingdom* (Right Now Press Ltd, 2001). He has published articles on topics that range from Soviet war literature to political correctness. Prior to taking up an academic career he was a professional soldier and served in the Parachute Regiment of the Special Air Service.

Joseph E. Fallon, author of *Deconstructing America: Immigration, Nationality and Statehood* and a co-editor of the seven-volume history *German-Americans in the World Wars*, is a freelance writer/researcher. He began his Masters Degree program at the American University of Cairo, Egypt, and obtained his Masters in International Affairs from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs.

Wayne Lutton, Ph.D. (history), editor of *The Social Contract*, is a policy analyst and historian. He has published widely on population and immigration concerns. With a Ph.D. in history, Dr. Lutton has been research director for an educational institute and a college professor and is the author or contributor to many books and monographs, including *The Immigration Time Bomb* (revised 1988) and *The Immigration Invasion*. His articles and reviews have appeared in *Chronicles*, *National Review*, *The Social Contract,* and other journals of scholarship and opinion.

Richard Lynn, Ph.D., professor emeritus of psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Londonderry, Northern Ireland, is the author most recently of *Eugenics: A Reassessment* (Praeger, 2001), *The Science of Human Diversity: A History of the Pioneer Fund* (University Press of America, 2001), and *Dysgenics: Genetic Deterioration in Modern Populations* (Praeger, 1996). Other published writings include "National IQ and Economic Development: A Study of Eighty-One Developing Nations," (with Tatu Vanhanen), *Mankind Quarterly* (Summer 2001); "Geographical Variation in Intelligence," in *The Scientific Study of Human Nature: Tribute to Hans J. Eysenck at Eighty*, (editor) Helmuth Nyborg (Pergamon, 1997); "The Decline of Genotypic Intelligence" and "In Support of the Nutrition Theory," in *The Rising Curve: Long-Term Gains in IQ and Related Measures*, (editor) Ulric Neisser (APA, 1998). Dr. Lynn is a contributor to various monographs and psychological journals, his previous books include *Educational Achievement in Japan: Lessons for the West* (M.E. Sharpe, 1988); (editor) *Dimensions of Personality: Papers in Honour of H.J. Eysenck* (Pergamon, 1981); and *Personality and National Character* (Pergamon, 1971). He currently serves as an editorial advisor to *Mankind Quarterly*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kevin MacDonald, Ph.D., professor of psychology, California State University-Long Beach, is the editor of *Population and Environment* and former editor of the *Human Behavior and Evolution Society Newsletter*. He is the author most recently of *The Culture of Critique: An Evolutionary Analysis of Jewish Involvement in Twentieth-Century Intellectual and Political Movements* (Praeger, 1998), *Separation and Its Discontents: Toward an Evolutionary Theory of Anti-Semitism* (Praeger, 1998), and *A People that Shall Dwell Alone: Judaism As a Group Evolutionary Strategy* (Praeger, 1994). As a frequent contributor to monographs and author of numerous articles in evolutionary psychology, religion, and ethnic relations, his previous books include *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development* (Springer-Verlag, 1988), *Social and Personality Development: An Evolutionary Synthesis* (Plenum, 1988), and (editor) *Parent-Child Play: Descriptions and Implications* (State University of New York Press, 1993).

Brent A. Nelson, Ph.D., a freelance writer, is the author of *America Balkanized—Immigration's Challenge to Government* (American Immigration Control Foundation, 1994), as well as numerous articles and book reviews.

James C. Russell, Ph.D., is the author of *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation* (Oxford University Press, 1994) and has taught classes at Saint Peter's College, New Jersey.

Jared Taylor, editor of *American Renaissance* and president of the New Century Foundation, is a graduate of Yale and the Paris Institute of Political Studies. He is the author or editor of several books, most recently, *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America* (New Century Books, 1998) and *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America* (Carroll & Graf, 1992).

Derek Turner, editor of the London-based conservative quarterly *Right Now!*, is a British journalist and frequent contributor to *Chronicles* and *The Social Contract*.

Miles D. Wolpin, Ph.D., J.D., is professor emeritus of political science, State University of New York, Potsdam, (N.Y.), and the author of a dozen books, including *Alternative Security and Military Dissent* (Austin & Winfield, 1994) and *America Insecure: Arms Transfers, Global Interventionism, and the Erosion of National Security* (McFarland & Co., 1991), as well as scores of articles on militarism, national security, Third World politics, and immigration. He is a frequent contributor to *The Social Contract*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED